Concordia Theological Monthly

Vol. VII JULY, 1936 No. 7

Political Contacts of the Hebrews with Assyria and Babylonia.

(Concluded.)

Olmstead believes Hezekiah realized that Egypt was indeed a broken reed and decided to make his peace with the Assyrian king and therefore sent the above-mentioned tribute to Sennacherib after his return to Nineveh. But is it probable that Hezekiah would pay such a heavy tribute after the Assyrian monarch had been so completely crushed, had evacuated Palestine, and was now in far-away Nineveh? We are rather inclined to believe that Sennacherib is telling us an untruth to gild the termination of his campaign and to cover up his shame and disgrace. An untruth of this type is nothing unusual in the annals of the Assyrian kings. It is quite commonly known that the Assyrian kings oftentimes tell monumental lies on their monuments. A case in point is Sennacherib's description of the drawn battle at Halulê on the lower Tigris, in 691, against the Babylonians and Elamites, the most boastful description of a battle that has come down to us from Assyria. Sennacherib took the fenced cities of Judah, it is true, but Jerusalem remained inviolate according to the promise of the Lord; nor does the Assyrian anywhere assert to have taken it.

It is commonly held among scholars that 2 Kings 18 f. (Is. 36 f.) treats of two invasions of Sennacherib. In reply to this theory let it suffice to state that the Bible plainly speaks of only one campaign and that the cuneiform records make no mention of another expedition against Judah in the days of Sennacherib.

The great Assyrian king died as foretold by Isaiah. While he was worshiping in the shrine of Nisroch at Nineveh, he was assassinated by his two sons Adrammelech and Sharezer. Nisroch has been identified with Marduk. But for one thing, Marduk is regularly transliterated as Merodach in the Old Testament. We prefer to

connect Nisroch with the Assyrian Nusku. The Hebrew נסרך would then be a scribal error for נסוך. The ו and the ר can easily be mistaken the one for the other. (Cp. the Table of Alphabets in Gesenius's Hebrew Grammar.) We realize that there are difficulties connected also with this identification; but that is the best one we know of at the present time. The names of Sennacherib's sons, Adrammelech and Sharezer, who committed the atrocity in 681 (2 Kings 19, 36 f.), plainly correspond to the Arad Malik and the Nabu-shar-usur of the cuneiform records. Sharezer is merely a shorter form for Nebo-sharezer. The first part of an Assyrian name can easily be dropped.[28] The Babylonian Chronicle speaks of only one as the assassin, without mentioning him by name.[29] But that presents no real difficulty. The latter probably refers to the actual assassin, while the Biblical account includes the accomplice. Moreover, 2 Kings 19, 37 is supported by a statement of Esarhaddon, the son and successor of Sennacherib. He says: "They [his brothers] revolted, and to secure the kingship, Sennacherib *they* killed." [30]

Sennacherib was followed by his son Esarhaddon (681—669). Internal troubles at his accession and the invasion of the tribes east of Assyria led to the revolt of Sidon, whose only mentioned ally was Sanduarri of the Taurus region. Egypt may have been in the background of the revolt. Esarhaddon marched against the rebels, took and destroyed Sidon in 677, and made a treaty with Tyre. After these successes he returned to Nineveh.

However, he was not long permitted to rest on his laurels. Soon he again proceeded against the West, the chief objective this time being Egypt, the cause of constant revolt among the Syro-Palestinians. But before undertaking the journey across the blazing sands to its border, Esarhaddon determined to win over or at least to tame the Arab tribes east and southeast of the Gulf of Akabah and in the Sinaitic peninsula.

In spite of these precautions his first attempts to conquer Egypt failed (674—673). This roused the Westland to new efforts, and new states revolted, among which were Tyre, Ashkelon, and Judah (2 Kings 21; 2 Chron. 33). His second campaign against Egypt (671) was crowned with success. The dream of former Assyrian monarchs had come true. Egypt now became an Assyrian province, administered by Assyrian officers. On his march homeward Ashkelon and Tyre surrendered; and Manasseh, king of Judah, was led captive

28) A. T. Olmstead, *History of Assyria*, p. 343.

29) H. Winckler, *Keilinschriftliches Textbuch zum Alten Testament*, p. 65.

30) Quoted in Olmstead's *History of Assyria*, p. 338. For the reign of Sennacherib see pp. 283—315 of the work just referred to and the same author's *History of Palestine and Syria*, pp. 455—481.

to Babylon, where Esarhaddon loved to dwell.[31] Doubtless Manasseh did not go into captivity alone; it is not beyond the range of probability that other prominent citizens of Judah were led away as well and that it was at this time that Esarhaddon brought in the captives mentioned in Ezra 4, 1 f., to fill the waste territory caused by the deportation of the Jewish unfortunates. During his term of imprisonment and punishment, Manasseh repented and was restored to the throne, 2 Chron. 33, 10 ff. The story of Manasseh's restoration is fully supported; for we know that Ashurbanipal, the successor of Esarhaddon, carried captive to Nineveh the Egyptian rebel Necho of Sais and after his duly sworn allegiance sent him back to his post. Likewise the Arabian rebel Abiate' (Abiyatha) succeeded in placating Ashurbanipal and was made king in place of a certain Iauta' (Yatha).[32] It is of no consequence that Manasseh's restoration is not mentioned in the Assyrian annals; it was a matter of minor importance in the affairs of the conqueror.

Esarhaddon's successor on the throne of Assyria was Ashurbanipal (Sardanapalus). His long reign marked the height of Assyrian expansion and came to an end ca. 626. In Egypt Esarhaddon's death was greeted by Tirhaka the Nubian as an opportunity to restore his own rule. That brought the Assyrian army to Egypt, in 667. For this expedition Manasseh of Judah, the kings of Ammon, Moab, Edom, Ashkelon, Ekron, Gaza, Cyprus, and others, twenty-two vassal kings in all, had to furnish land forces and marines and, besides, had to admit the Assyrian tribute collectors to their cities and provide for them.[33]

About 640 Ashurbanipal penetrated Elam and destroyed Susa. First of all Assyrian kings, he entered the palace of the kings of Elam and opened their treasure-house. All the spoil which the Elamites had in former times carried off from the land of the two rivers or which had been given them in payment by Shamash-shumukin of Babylon and the palace furniture became Assyrian prey. The temple tower of the chief shrine was torn down, and much booty was carried off to Assyria. To this period probably belongs Ezra 4, 9 f., where the author of an Aramaic letter incorporated into the Book of Ezra lists men of Babylon, Susa, Dahha, and Elam as part of the nations settled in Samaria by the great and noble Osnapper, whom scholars commonly identify with Ashurbanipal.[34]

Ashurbanipal was succeeded by Ashur-etil-ilani (626—621), who,

---

31) Ira M. Price places this incident in the reign of Ashurbanipal, p. 340.

32) J. H. Breasted, *A History of Egypt*, p. 557; Bruno Meissner, *op. cit.*, pp. 231 f.; 245 f.; D. D. Luckenbill, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 338.

33) D. D. Luckenbill, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 340.

34) A. T. Olmstead, *History of Assyria*, pp. 485—488.

in turn, was followed by Sin-shar-ishkun (the Sarakos of the Greeks), the last king of Assyria proper, who occupied the throne from 620 to 612.[35])

We must now direct our attention to Babylon. On the death of Ashurbanipal the vast Assyrian empire fell to pieces, and Nabopolassar, whom Sin-shar-ishkun had sent as his general to defend Babylonia against an invasion of the People of the Sealands (around the Persian Gulf), revolted against his royal master and established himself as king of Babylon. By 616 all of Babylonia was under his control. His next objective was Mesopotamia. He at once invaded it; but after a number of successful battles we suddenly find him on a hasty retreat to his capital, in September of that some year, 616.

There was a reason for that unexpected retreat. Early in his reign, Psammetichus I, king of Egypt from 664 to 610, had been a vassal of Ashurbanipal; then he had revolted and liberated Egypt; next he had aided Shamash-shum-ukin of Babylon in his unfortunate revolt; and now, full of years and in control of an Egypt prosperous as never since the days of the eighteenth dynasty (1580—1350), he began to dream of following the example set by the Assyrians in a conquest of the fertile lands of Palestine and Syria. Nothing was to be feared from Assyria, as her power was no longer felt along the Mediterranean; but a renewed Babylonia was quite contrary to the calculations and wishes of Psammetichus. He desired to have a weak Assyria linger on as a convenient shock-absorber between Palestino-Syria and the rising power of Babylon and the northeastern barbarians. And so the empire which had called him vassal in his youth was supported in his old age as a buffer state against the rising power of another former Assyrian vassal, Babylonia. When the intelligence reached Psammetichus that Mesopotamia had been invaded by Nabopolassar, he forthwith set his troops in motion, and only the hasty departure of the Babylonians prevented them from being overtaken at Gablinu, in the vicinity of Nippur.

Nabopolassar then tried the line east of the Tigris and crossed the river to Ashur. The city was besieged, but the siege proved unsuccessful for the Babylonians. Nabopolassar had thus been checked both on the Euphrates and on the Tigris, by Psammetichus and Sin-shar-ishkum, respectively. Thus far conditions in Assyria were not inauspicious for the future.

But unfortunately for Assyria this was the moment chosen by another of her enemies to enter the struggle — the Medes. Headed by Cyaxares, they appeared before Nineveh in August of 614, but were unable to take the city. Cyaxares then passed down the Tigris

35) A. T. Olmstead, *op. cit.*, pp. 627—633; Bruno Meissner, *op. cit.*, p. 253 ff.

to Ashur. This, however, ran contrary to the wishes of Nabopolassar, who had no desire to see all his former efforts wasted and Ashur in the hands of a probable rival. And at once Nabopolassar hurried off his troops "to the aid of the Median"; but "the Median" had no desire whatsoever to see Ashur in the hands of Nabopolassar and did not care for his "aid." Therefore Cyaxares attacked the city immediately, and when Nabopolassar arrived with his army, he was faced by an accomplished fact. Now that he was in possession of the ancient Assyrian capital, Cyaxares was quite willing to come to terms with the master of so large a body of soldiers. And amid the ruins of Ashur friendship and alliance were established; and to seal the agreement, Nabopolassar's son Nebuchadnezzar was married to Amyitis, the daughter of Cyaxares's son Astyages.

By June of 612 all was ready for the final attack on Nineveh. Nabopolassar and Cyaxares mustered their forces and marched up the Tigris. Three battles were fought from June to August, and then the city was assaulted, captured, utterly destroyed, buried by the sand and dust and dirt of the storms, and her burial-place forgotten for centuries; yea, people actually plowed on the site of the former city, which for ages had been a proverb for riches and power throughout the Near East. The brief words of the Babylonian Chronicle, "A great havoc was made of the people and the nobles; . . . they [the enemy] carried off the booty of the city, a quantity beyond reckoning, and turned the city into heaps and ruins," are the counterpart of Nahum's prophecy concerning the fall of Nineveh: "Take ye the spoil of silver, take the spoil of gold; for there is none end of the store and glory out of all the vessels of desire. She is empty and void and waste. There is a multitude of slain and a great number of carcasses; and there is none end of their corpses; they stumble upon their corpses." The ash heaps and calcined sculptures still show how intense was the fire in which the palaces and the temples met their doom at the hands of the Medes and the Babylonians. The latter played only a subordinate part; the weight of the attack was borne by the Medes. The Babylonians were not particularly good soldiers, and it was up to Cyaxares to pull the chestnuts out of the fire. However, when it came to dividing the conquered empire, then Nabopolassar knew how to secure for himself the fattest portions. He annexed Elam, certain other districts east of the Tigris, and the Euphrates region along the road to Syria and Palestine, while Cyaxares received Assyria (in the narrower sense of the term), Mesopotamia, and a portion of Asia Minor.[36])

"The enemy had done his work thoroughly," says R. C. Thompson, "and the terraced mounds, fair palaces, imposing temples, lay

36) Bruno Meissner, *op. cit.*, p. 258.

ruined and despoiled of their treasures. The great library of Ashurbanipal, stored with copies of thousands of clay tablets collected from so many sources and with such care, was broken up and the contents scattered broadcast over the ruins. The splendor of the temple of Ishtar, which lay close to the east of Sennacherib's palace, was brought to naught, and none was left to worship in the fane of the mother-goddess, whose statue, so proudly dedicated many hundreds of years before by Ashur-bel-kala, was cast out headless to lie humbled in the dust. Fallen, too, was the second great temple of Nineveh, dedicated to Nabu, which lay near the southern corner of Ashurbanipal's palace, solid of foundation and high of wall, wherein Ashurbanipal in his delight at his victories over the Elamites had commemorated his piety towards the god with stone slabs recording his prowess. The foe in his onslaught had broken them up, shattered the stone flooring, scattered the little library of which the priests were so proud, and left naught but the foundations. The parks with their almond blossoms, their fragrant lilies, their cotton-plants, the gardens where the lions roamed and the storks chattered, all the beauty of Nineveh now lay waste."[37]) Zephaniah's prophecy, fulfilled in detail, sounds like a *vaticinium post eventum:* "And He [Jehovah] will stretch out His hand against the north and destroy Assyria and will make Nineveh a desolation and dry like a wilderness. And flocks shall lie down in the midst of her, all the beasts of the nations. Both the cormorant [pelican] and the bittern shall lodge in the upper lintels of it; their voice shall sing in the windows; desolation shall be in the thresholds; for He shall uncover the cedar work. This is the rejoicing city that dwelt carelessly, that said in her heart, I am, and there is none beside me. How is she become a desolation, a place for beasts to lie down in! Every one that passeth by her shall hiss and wag his hand," Zeph. 2, 13 ff.

According to Diodorus and Xenophon[38]) the capture of the city was made possible only by a great storm of rain and thunder, which caused the river to rise and sweep away the wall to a length of twenty stadia. This would be in conformity with Nah. 1, 8: "With an overrunning flood he will make an utter end of the palace thereof, and darkness shall pursue his enemies"; and 2, 6: "The gates of the rivers shall be opened, and the palace shall be dissolved." All this agrees very well with the season as indicated in the Nabopolassar Chronicle discovered by C. J. Gadd and published in his little book *The Fall of Nineveh.* From this chronicle we know that the final siege of Nineveh lasted from the month of Sivan to the month of Ab, *i. e.,* about from the beginning of June till some time in August.

37) In *The Cambridge Ancient History,* Vol. III, p. 206.

38) Diodorus, II, 27, 1; Xenophon, *Anabasis,* III, 4, 7—12.

The heaviest rainfall in the Nineveh region normally occurs about March, together with the melting of the Armenian snows, with the result that the Tigris, where Nineveh was located, attains its greatest volume in April and May and begins to fall toward the end of the latter month. The Medes and Babylonians evidently took advantage of the devastation caused by an unusually high Tigris in the preceding spring to press home their assault on the only place in the wall which had been rendered vulnerable.[39])

The fall of Nineveh closed the history of Assyria proper. As we pause for a moment, we are reminded of the words of Nahum: "Thy shepherds slumber, O king of Assyria; thy nobles shall dwell in the dust; thy people is scattered upon the mountains, and no man gathereth them. There is no healing of thy bruise," Nah. 3, 18 f. Only a handful of Assyrians who were able to flee out of Nineveh struggled on. A certain Assyrian noble called Ashuruballit escaped the Babylonian troops and with Egyptian aid was able to assume the title of "king of Assyria" in a new capital, Harran in Mesopotamia. Harran lay on the road from Nineveh to the Mediterranean and from early times had formed a kind of western capital of the empire. It had, moreover, the advantage of being directly accessible to Egyptian armies, upon which the new king had to rely.

After the victory Cyaxares returned home, in September of 612. Nabopolassar occupied Nisibis and took tribute from the land of Rusapu, but apparently did not choose to winter amid the hills, especially since his ally had gone home; and he, too, returned home, to Babylonia; let the Assyrian wait in Harran. The following year saw a marked relaxation of activities after the great events at Nineveh. Nabopolassar marched against this new "land of Assyria," but was finally obliged to call in the Medes, and Ashur-uballit and his allies were driven out and fled across the Euphrates. Harran was thoroughly plundered and the great temple of the moon-god left in ruins.

But even that could not damp the spirit of the unconquered Ashur-uballit. The vigorous Egyptian king Necho II, who had replaced his father, Psammetichus I, the previous year, sent a great army to his aid, and with these men Ashur-uballit appeared in Mesopotamia in July, 609. He crossed the Euphrates, cut off a Babylonian garrison, and up to September assault upon assault was made on Harran. Now Nabopolassar came to the aid of his troops and defeated Ashur-uballit in battle. Of his fate we know nothing more.

In 608 Necho appeared personally in Syria. His aim was to join forces with the remnants of the Assyrians and to secure Palestine. Josiah, king of Judah, tried to block his advance, but was defeated

39) C. J. Gadd, *The Fall of Nineveh.*

and killed in the battle of Megiddo, and Necho swept on to the Euphrates after having laid Judah under tribute, 2 Kings 23, 29 ff.; 2 Chron. 35, 20 ff.[40])

According to the King James Version of 2 Kings 23, 29, Necho went "*against* the king of Assyria." However, from the Nabopolassar Chronicle and from Josephus [41]) we know that the Egyptian king went up to fight against the Medes and the Babylonians. It is obvious that the Hebrew עַל in this connection is equivalent to אֶל. (Cp. Gesenius's dictionary.)

At this point let us cast at least a fleeting glance at the much-disputed question why Josiah opposed Necho on his march to the Euphrates. We need not go far afield to find the answer. Josiah realized that Assyria was lying on her death-bed and was in dire need of help; and trusting in the true God, whose worship he had restored, he tried to block the advance of the Egyptian and to keep him from restoring Assyria to her former health and strength; on the contrary, said he, let her die! He evidently hoped thus to free himself of Assyrian domination and to regain his independence.[41a])

The armies of Egypt and the remnant of Assyrian forces met the Babylonian troops near Carchemish, in 605, to decide the question of the supremacy of Southwestern Asia, of which Nabopolassar considered himself the legitimate heir, since it had been a dependency of Assyria, which the Babylonians had conquered, aided by the Medes. Because of illness, Nabopolassar could not himself lead his men to battle, and so his oldest son, Nebuchadrezzar, was placed in charge of the army. He came up on the right bank of the Euphrates, fell upon the Egyptians, and inflicted a sweeping defeat on his foe. Necho and his troops were forced to flee back through Palestine to the Nile, and all Syria fell to the Babylonians. Then Phenicia and Philistia were taken. Judah, which had been a vassal of Egypt (2 Kings 23, 34), submitted next. In 2 Kings 24, 1 we read: "In his [Jehoiakim's] days Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, came up, and Jehoiakim became his servant three years." At this time, in 605, took place what we read in Dan. 1, 1—7: "In the third year of the reign of Jehoiakim, king of Judah, came Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, unto Jerusalem and besieged it. And the Lord gave Jehoiakim, king of Judah, into his hand. . . . And the king spake unto Ashpenaz, the master of his eunuchs, that he should bring certain of the children of Israel and of the king's seed and of the princes," etc. Thus we have in 605 a beginning of the captivity of the Jews in Babylonia.

Nebuchadrezzar next advanced against Egypt. While he was at

---

40) A. T. Olmstead, *History of Assyria*, pp. 634—640.

41) Josephus, *Antiquities*, X, 5, 1.

41 a) Compare Vol. II, 38—45, of this journal.

the River of Egypt, he received the sad news that his father Nabopolassar had died in May or June of 604. He handed over his troops with the Syrian and Jewish captives to his friends and hurried to Babylon, where he was received as king without a sign of trouble and began a reign as brilliant as it was long and as powerful as it was brilliant. He was a vigorous and brilliant commander and physically as well as mentally a strong man; the greatest personality of his time in the Near East as a soldier, a statesman, and an architect. Of him Jeremiah said: "All nations shall serve him and his son and his son's son until the very time of his own land come," Jer. 27, 7.

To him Jehoiakim of Judah had paid tribute for three years, 2 Kings 24, 1. But driven by a popular party, he rebelled and refused to be considered a vassal of the Babylonians any longer, against the urgent advice of Jeremiah, 21, 9—11. Subsequently Nebuchadrezzar invaded Palestine and besieged Jerusalem ca. 597. Jehoiakim was bound in fetters to be led to Babylon, 2 Chron. 36, 6. But before he could be led away, he died. Jeremiah had prophesied: "He shall be buried with the burial of an ass, drawn and cast forth beyond the gates of Jerusalem. His dead body shall be cast out in the day to the heat and in the night to the frost," Jer. 22, 19; 36, 30. "It is not inconceivable that all the records are true," says Price, "that in the general capture of the city he was taken with other captives, that upon examination he still showed a rebellious spirit and was slain by order of the king and disgraced by being cast without the city and left unburied." [42])

Nebuchadrezzar chose Jehoiachin to be the successor of Jehoiakim. A period of but three months was sufficient to test the spirit of the young ruler. His defiance of Babylonian overlordship once more brought the Chaldean army upon Jerusalem. At the approach of Nebuchadrezzar, Jehoiachin surrendered. Accompanied by his mother and all his officials, the young king went out through the gate in hope of mercy. Mercy was granted to the degree that no one was slain, but Jehoiachin was carried off to Babylon with his mother, his whole court, seven thousand of his men of might, and a thousand craftsmen and smiths. This policy of deportation for crushing a rebellion was not quite the same as that inaugurated by the Assyrians, who "scattered their captives, so that they were rapidly assimilated by their neighbors and were deprived of all possibility of maintaining their own national life. These Jewish captives of Nebuchadrezzar were, on the other hand, enabled by their concentration to continue the offices of their religion and by that means maintain their exclusiveness." [43]) Nebuchadrezzar's plan served a twofold purpose:

42) Ira M. Price, *op. cit.*, pp. 351—354.
43) R. W. Rogers, *op. cit.*, p. 361.

it guaranteed, for at least a period, the submission of this western section, and it furnished him skilful craftsmen to carry out his elaborate projects in the rehabilitation of Babylonia.

Mattaniah, the twenty-one-year-old uncle of the deposed king, was given the vacant throne, but his kingdom was strictly limited to the territory about the capital. He was forced to swear a solemn oath by Jehovah to be loyal to his new lord; and that he might ever be mindful of his oath, his name was changed to Zedekiah, 2 Kings 24, 10—12. 15—18; 2 Chron. 36, 9—13. For a while he was loyal to his Babylonian master, and he would probably have kept his oath had it not been for the seductions of Hophra (Apries), king of Egypt, who was anxious to win back Syria for himself. Hophra roused to rebellion the people of Edom, Moab, Ammon, Tyre, and Sidon. These sent envoys to Zedekiah, urging him to revolt and to assist them; and soon Judah joined the ranks of the rebels.

In 588 Nebuchadrezzar appeared on the scene, and the effort to starve the city by siege began. Jeremiah advised capitulation and promised consequent mercy and life for the inhabitants; but his words went unheeded. True to their oath, the Egyptians came to the aid of Zedekiah, and the Babylonians were compelled to raise the siege, but only long enough to defeat the Egyptians and to drive them back to the Nile.

The Babylonians returned from their pursuit of the Egyptians, the siege of Jerusalem was renewed, and about July of 586 the walls were breached, and the Babylonians poured into the city. Zedekiah and his men of war fled that night by the gate between the two walls at the southeast corner near the king's garden and the Pool of Siloam. They hoped to reach the Arabah and so to pass to the east Jordan country, but were overtaken at Jericho. Zedekiah was carried to Nebuchadrezzar at Riblah, where his sons were slain before his eyes, and then he was blinded that his last sight might be the end of his hopes of posterity.

A month later, to forestall any future rebellion in this strong fortress, Jerusalem was thoroughly plundered, the Temple, the palace, and all other buildings of importance were burned and the walls of the city broken down. The few remaining nobles were deported to Babylonia, and only the poorest peasants were left behind, as vine-dressers and husbandmen, 2 Kings 25, 1—21. The whole line of prosperous Shephelah towns were utterly destroyed and never re-occupied during our period. Gedaliah was appointed governor of such Jews as remained, and he took up his residence at Mizpah, in a great tower and three thick-walled rooms built against the inner city wall.

Jeremiah was brought from the court of the guard and invited to go in honor to Babylon for having rendered such splendid services to Nebuchadrezzar in weakening the morale of the Judean rebels by

predicting Jerusalem's inevitable doom. However, Jeremiah declined and was then sent with gifts from Ramah, where the captives had been collected, to Gedaliah at Mizpah, Jerem. 39, 14; 40, 1—6.

The leaders of the bands wandering about in the open country came to Gedaliah, who urged them to settle in the abandoned towns they had occupied and to gather in the wine, the summer fruits, and the oil. Approximately three quarters of the population remained, made up of the poor people. Fugitives from Edom, Moab, and Ammon swelled the remnant.[44])

Judah's leaders and prominent citizens were in captivity. Many of them were prosperous in business, at Tell Abib and Ahava on the Nehar Kebar near Nippur. The Murashu documents discovered in 1893 shed a great deal of light on the Jews in Nippur. These contract tablets were the archives of the firm Murashu Sons, who were bankers and brokers at Nippur in the days of Artaxerxes I and Darius II and cover the years 464—404, almost the same period as the Assuan Papyri (471—411). In modern times Nippur is called Niffer or Nuffar. It is located about fifty miles southeast of Babylon. Nippur was divided in two almost equal parts by a large, important canal, whose bed is now dry. In one of the Murashu tablets the canal is called Nar Kabari (the large canal), which corresponds to the Hebrew נְהַר־כְּבָר, Ezek. 1, 1. According to Hilprecht it "was the greatest canal of Babylonia proper, 'the great canal' *par excellence*, which branched off from the Euphrates somewhere above Babylon and ran through almost the whole interior of the country from north to south. It was the great artery which brought life and fertility to the otherwise barren alluvial plain enclosed by the Euphrates and the Tigris and turned the whole interior into one luxuriant garden. The 'Nar Kabari' had the same significance for Nippur, the most ancient and renowned city of the country, as the Euphrates for Sippara and Babylon or the Nile for Egypt and therefore was most appropriately called 'the Euphrates of Nippur' by the Sumerians, 'the great canal' by the Semitic Babylonians, and the 'river Nile' by the Arabic population of later times."[45]) There, on the banks of the Great Canal, a part of the Israelites put up their tents, and there the prophet Ezekiel saw his visions. Many of the Jews lived here even after the Exile, as long as Nippur existed, to judge from the many inscribed Hebrew vases excavated in the upper strata of its ruins. They owned land and possessed capital and took a full share in the commercial activity of the community. Many of them were employed in the service of the Babylonians and the Persians, for whom they transacted business. Others were rent collectors; others, again, were royal officials. This

44) A. T. Olmstead, *History of Palestine and Syria*, pp. 505—540.

45) H. V. Hilprecht, *Excavations in Assyria and Babylonia*, p. 413.

is borne out by the many Hebrew names that occur in the Murashu documents and by the functions these men performed. Among those names are such as Gedaliah, Haggai, Jonathan, Menahem, Berechiah, Mattaniah, Solomon, Zebediah, Nathanael, and Samson.[46])

Nebuchadrezzar's active reign of forty-three years closed with his death in 561. His had indeed been a very productive life. And in the eyes of the world his architectural and artistic efforts, fostered with all the zeal of an Oriental monarch, doubtless justified the pride with which he exclaimed: "Is not this great Babylon, that I have built for the house of the kingdom by the might of my power and for the honor of my majesty?" Dan. 4, 30. But such self-glorification did not meet with the approval of the Almighty. Nebuchadrezzar's own inscriptions naturally say nothing of his subsequent insanity, as recorded in Daniel. They speak only of a four-year-long suspension of interest in public affairs. In Daniel we have the cause for this suspension.

Amel-Marduk (or Awel-Marduk) fell heir to the splendid Babylonian government organized and administered by the political and military genius of his father Nebuchadrezzar. In 2 Kings 25, 27 he is called Evil-Merodach. One of his first acts was to free Jehoiachin from his thirty-seven-year-captivity and to place his throne above those of other subject kings. This policy was directly opposed to that of his father Nebuchadrezzar. Jehoiachin was permitted to marry. And in memory of the unexpected deeds of mercy he called the son that was born to him Pedaiah: Jehovah hath redeemed. Some one has made the assertion that thus Jeremiah's prediction that Jehoiachin would be childless was proved false. However, it is clear from the second part of Jer. 22, 30 that the prophet meant none of Jehoiachin's sons would ever sit on the royal throne of Judah; in that respect Jehoiachin would be "childless."

The priestly party soon became tired of Amel-Marduk and in about three years brought about his assassination and the accession of his brother-in-law Nergal-shar-usur (the Nergal-sharezer of Jer. 39, 3). He was a strong character, an old warrior and officer at the fall of Jerusalem, and endeavored to follow as far as possible in the footsteps of Nebuchadrezzar, his father-in-law.

Before the expiration of but four years (559—555) of successful administration Nergal-shar-usur died and left the throne to his young son Nabashi-Marduk. He was assassinated after only nine months of a precarious tenure of the throne because he was said to be incapable

---

46) H. V. Hilprecht and A. T. Clay, *Business Documents of Murashu Sons of Nippur Dated in the Reign of Artaxerxes I;* A. T. Clay, *Business Documents of Murashu Sons of Nippur Dated in the Reign of Darius II;* Samuel Daiches, *The Jews in Babylonia in the Time of Ezra and Nehemiah according to Babylonian Inscriptions.*

of ruling and to have displayed evil traits of character. But this may simply have been an excuse to justify his violent removal as a plot of the priestly party. However, that may have been, Nabonidus was installed as the new king.

Herodotus calls him Λαβύνητος,[47]) which is clearly a corruption of the Babylonian Nabu-na'id. The father of Nabonidus belonged to the nobility in Harran. His mother seems to have been a high-priestess of the moon-god Sin at Harran. If she was, we must probably attribute to her influence his ardent interest in religious matters. Nabonidus may have been a member of the priestly party himself. Properly speaking, he was neither a Babylonian nor a Chaldean, but a Mesopotamian Aramean.

His wife, Nitocris, the mother of Belshazzar, seems to have been a daughter of Nebuchadrezzar and his Egyptian wife Nitocris.[48]) If such was the case, Nebuchadrezzar could rightfully be called the אָב of Belshazzar (Dan. 5, 2. 11. 18), which would then mean "grandfather," a perfectly good usage, as can be seen from Gen. 28, 13, where Abraham is called the אָב of Jacob; from 2 Sam. 9, 7, where Saul is referred to as the אָב of Mephibosheth, who in reality was the grandson of Saul; and from the wide range of meaning of the Hebrew word אָב in general. However that may be, the references in Dan. 5 to Nebuchadrezzar as the אָב of Belshazzar cannot be considered a scientifically established error.

Soon after his accession, Nabonidus formed an alliance with Cyrus, by which it was agreed that Nabonidus should at once attack Syria (then controlled by the Medes), while Cyrus should revolt from Astyages, king of the Medes. The arrangement was a politic one on both sides. It meant that the Medes would have their hands full at both ends of their empire, that their forces would be divided, and that Cyrus and Nabonidus could gain their objects more easily. Throughout 554 Nabonidus was engaged in collecting forces for his operations in Syria. These troops were assembled not only from Babylonia itself, but also from Phenicia and Palestine. The following year he set off for Syria. In 550 Cyrus revolted from Astyages and thus kept his share of the bargain which he had assumed. Nabonidus was successful, and in 542 he left Syria and went against the city of Tema, the Biblical תֵּימָא (Gen. 25, 15; Jer. 25, 23; Job 6, 19; Is. 21, 14) and the modern Teima, located in Arabia Felix and still one of the main trade centers. In one inscription we also find the term "the land of Tema," which refers to the city and its environs and corresponds to the אֶרֶץ תֵּימָא of Is. 21. Nabonidus captured it, put its king to death, and then settled down in the city, built a palace in the Babylonian style,

47) Herodotus, I, 74.

48) R. P. Dougherty, *Nabonidus and Belshazzar*, pp. 60—63.

and beautified the place in general.[49] As far as available evidence is concerned, he appears to have spent nearly all of his reign at this place, for unknown reasons, at a great distance from the throne which he had ascended.

Before Nabonidus set out for Syria, he "entrusted the kingship" (*sharrutu*) to his eldest son, Belshazzar.[50] The exact amount of regal responsibility and authority placed upon Belshazzar is of course not indicated by that statement. The nature of his position must be determined by other considerations.

It should be noted, in the first place, that no cuneiform text applies the term of "king" to Belshazzar. His title remains "the son of the king" or "the crown prince" (*mar sharri*). The term "king" is applied to his father Nabonidus only. In the second place, even during his absence from Babylonia, Nabonidus did not relinquish his position as the first ruler in the empire. All fully dated cuneiform documents written during his absence still refer to him as the king. And when Nabonidus and Belshazzar are mentioned together, precedence is regularly given to the former. In the third place, we have evidence that Belshazzar was subject to the commands of Nabonidus. This is clearly borne out by the following inscription: "The seed field of the god Bel, which in the month of Nisan of the seventh year of Nabonidus, the king of Babylon, Belshazzar, the son of the king, *at the command of the king* divided for the tax-masters."[51] This command was issued while Nabonidus was in Tema, and it was carried out, as the document plainly shows.

It is evident that Belshazzar was the coregent of his father, associated with him not on terms of equality, but as the second ruler in the empire. Dan. 5, 7. 16. 29 is in remarkable harmony with such a state of affairs. There we read that Daniel was rewarded by being made "the third ruler in the kingdom." Nabonidus was the first ruler, Belshazzar the second; hence Daniel was made the third ruler and not the second, as we should otherwise expect (cp. the case of Joseph).[51a]

Owing to Nabonidus's long absence in Arabia, however, Belshazzar's role as a temporary substitute on the throne vanished, and he assumed prominence as the only male representative of the dynasty at the capital of the empire. He was in reality the acting sovereign of Babylonia, while Nabonidus exercised a reduced influence on home affairs during his prolonged absence in Arabia. There were thus two

---

49) Sidney Smith, *Babylonian Historical Texts*, pp. 44—53 and 77.

50) *A Persian Verse Account*, col. II, 20. (Published in Sidney Smith, *op. cit.*)

51) R. P. Dougherty, *op. cit.*, pp. 136 f. and 96.

51 a) Cp. Vol. III, 215, of this journal.

potentates in the empire, one who maintained his seat of power in distant Arabia and one who directed affairs in Babylonia.

We need therefore not be surprised that three tablets from Erech (Uruk), dated in the twelfth year of Nabonidus, state that, when a contract was made, the parties concerned took their oath by the deities Bel, Nabu, the Lady of Erech, and Nana, and the decrees of "Nabonidus, the king of Babylon, and Belshazzar, the son of the king." [52] This fact is worthy of note, since from the time of Hammurabi (ca. 2100) it was customary among the Babylonians to swear by the gods and the reigning *king*.[53] But here we have a case where people in a business transaction take an oath in the name of the king and the name of "the *son* of the king," which plainly points to the high position occupied by Belshazzar. There is no other instance in available documents of an oath's being sworn in the name of the son of the king, *i. e.*, in the name of the crown prince.

There is nothing unusual about the fact that Nabonidus made Belshazzar his coregent. Long before that, we find cases where the future successor to the throne or another son of the king was made and called king during his father's lifetime. Jehoshaphat of Judah appointed his son Jehoram king of Judah seven years before his death (cp. 2 Kings 8, 16 with 1, 19). When Uzziah was smitten with leprosy, his son Jotham was made king of Judah, although Uzziah was still living and was still regarded as king in the final summing up of the years of his reign. Assyrian and Persian history furnish further striking precedents for this political procedure. Sennacherib placed his son Ashur-nadin-shum upon the throne of Babylon, and Esarhaddon not only made his son Shamash-shum-ukin king of Babylon, but crowned his first-born, Ashurbanipal, king of Assyria.[54] And, finally, Herodotus reports that Darius Hystaspes appointed Xerxes to be king over the Persians, "as he was about to lead forth his levies against Egypt and Athens." [55]

While Nabonidus was in Tema and Belshazzar was the virtual ruler of Babylon, the storm-clouds were gathering. In 550 Cyrus of Anshan, in Elam, revolted from the Median king Astyages and brought the empire of the formerly overpowering Medes to an end. The Persians under Cyrus now fell heir to all that the Medes had won. The Lydian empire was taken, and before the end of 545 the entire peninsula of Asia Minor was a part of the new Persian empire.[56] The next objective of Cyrus was Babylon. But thanks to

---

52) R. P. Dougherty, *op. cit.*, pp. 136 f. and 96.

53) *American Journal for Semitic Languages*, XXIX, 65—94; XXX, 196—211.

54) *Cambridge Ancient History*, Vol. III, 66. 87. L. W. King, *History of Babylonia*, p. 271.

55) Herodotus, VII, 2. 3. 56) R. W. Rogers, *op. cit.*, pp. 375—378.

Nebuchadrezzar's vast projects the entire region round about the capital was a huge fortified camp, which could not be starved, for within its outer walls were fields sufficient to feed the whole population. Hence Cyrus decided on a policy of encirclement, hoping that in the mean time the disaffected elements within Babylon itself might revolt. A Persian governor was sent to occupy Erech, the most important city south of Babylon, while an Elamite general of Cyrus entered North Babylonia. In 539 Cyrus defeated the Babylonian army at Opis, where the only real battle of the campaign was fought. Sippar, another city north of Babylon, was taken without a blow, and the capital lay isolated.[57])

"On the sixteenth day (of October, 539) Gobryas (Ugbaru), the governor of Gutium, and the troops of Cyrus entered Babylon without a battle."[58]) This terse note of the chronicler will bear elucidation. Gobryas was governor of Gutium (a district north of Babylon and east of the Tigris) and the chief general of Cyrus. According to Xenophon he was a man of years coming to Cyrus and offering his help in the capture of the Babylonian capital, the motive for his hostility toward it being that he had been maltreated at the hands of the Babylonian king. Herodotus and Xenophon relate that the Babylonians shut themselves in, relying upon a great store of provisions which had been gathered. A tedious siege followed the investment of their capital. Cyrus saw that he could not take the city by assault, and hence he had a large trench dug for the purpose of diverting part of the stream which flowed through Babylon. When all the necessary preparations had been made, he waited until the time of a festival which the Babylonians were accustomed to observe with drinking and revelry throughout the night (cp. Dan. 5, 1—4). Then he lowered the river by causing much of its water to flow aside, and when the stream was sufficiently shallow to allow his troops access to the city, the great metropolis was entered (cp. Is. 44, 27), Gobryas conducting the attack.[59]) Seventeen days after the military occupation of the city had been achieved by Gobryas, Cyrus entered it in person and was received joyfully. There had been enough time for adjustment to the new situation, and all opposition to Cyrus could have been effectually broken by that time.

It will be of interest to consider where Nabonidus was at the time of the siege and capture of Babylon and who was in charge of the capital. Nabonidus appears to have returned from Tema to the Tigro-Euphrates Valley not long before Babylon was taken,[60]) but *when* he returned and where he was at that critical time, we have no

---

57) and 58) Nabonidus Chronicle, col. III, 12—15. (Published in Sid. Smith, *op. cit.*)

59) Herodotus, I, 190 f. Xenophon, *Cyropaedia*, VII, 5, 1—36.

60) Sidney Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 102 f.

means of knowing. But we do know that he was not in Babylon; for we read in the Nabonidus Chronicle: "On the fourteenth [of October], Sippar was taken without a battle. Nabonidus fled. On the sixteenth, Gobryas, the governor of Gutium, and the troops of Cyrus entered Babylon without a battle. *Afterwards Nabonidus, when he returned to Babylon,* was taken prisoner." [61]) Consequently it appears to be a fair conclusion that Belshazzar was in command of the city when it was taken by the Medes and the Persians in 539, aside from the fact that our conclusion is borne out by Dan. 5. None of the available documents affirm that Belshazzar was present at the fall of Babylon, and no positive evidence against it has been found. These considerations will at the same time answer the question why Nabonidus is not mentioned in the Book of Daniel. He had little or no share in the events which transpired in Babylon in those fateful days; the real figure was Belshazzar. Hence the prominent role the latter plays in Daniel.[62])

Cyrus was a wise and tolerant ruler. We know from his inscriptions that he set free the various tribes held in Babylonian captivity, returned their gods, restored the temples of their deities, and granted religious liberty to all his subjects in and outside of Babylon. The Jews were not the only ones permitted to retrace their steps to their beloved fatherland; on the contrary, by the almighty will and power of the Lord of Hosts, a whole world was set in motion, as later on in the days of Caesar Augustus, in order that God's people might return to the land which He had promised the patriarchs and their descendants and in order that His holy Child might be born in Bethlehem for our salvation.

Oriental Institute, Chicago University. ALEX. HEIDEL.

Der Begriff „Gerechtigkeit" im Alten Teſtament, beſonders in den Pſalmen.

(Eine Konferenzarbeit.)

Einer der Grundbegriffe der von Gott in ſeinem Wort geoffenbarten Religion iſt Gerechtigkeit. Das rechte Verſtändnis dieſes Begriffs iſt eine notwendige Vorausſetzung der rechten Erkenntnis der Zentrallehre des Chriſtentums, nämlich der Lehre von der Rechtfertigung. Die göttliche Rechtfertigung iſt ja nichts anderes als das göttliche Urteil über einen ſündigen Menſchen, daß er „gerecht" ſei, daß er die Gerechtigkeit habe, die vor Gott gilt. Und zu dieſem Zweck hat der

61) Nabonidus Chronicle, col. III, 14—16.

62) Our section on Nabonidus and Belshazzar is based chiefly upon R. P. Dougherty's book of the same title.

gnädige Gott eigentlich uns sein Wort gegeben, daß wir daraus erkennen, wie wir die vor seinem Forum geltende Gerechtigkeit erlangen. Es ist ein beachtenswerter Umstand, daß wir dem Wort Gerechtigkeit in der Schrift zum erstenmal begegnen bei dem Bericht über Abrahams Rechtfertigung: „Abraham glaubte an den HErrn, בַּיהוָה, und das rechnete er ihm an als Gerechtigkeit", Gen. 15, 6. Wie Abraham diese Gerechtigkeit erlangte, ebenso müssen wir alle, wenn wir gerechtfertigt werden wollen, sie erlangen, wie der Apostel Röm. 4 und Gal. 3 ausführt.

I. Allgemeiner Überblick.

Die einem Nomen zugrundeliegende Idee oder Vorstellung erkennt man vor allem aus dem entsprechenden Verbum und dessen Derivaten. Das Verbum, das hier in Betracht kommt, ist צָדַק. Es hat die Meinung „gerecht sein, vollkommen sein, schuldlos sein" (Gesenius, Wörterbuch). Besonders deutlich tritt dies im Hiphil, הִצְדִּיק, hervor: jemanden „für gerecht oder schuldlos erklären", entsprechend dem δικαιοῦν des Neuen Testaments; cf. Ex. 23, 7; Ps. 82, 3; Prov. 17, 15, wo es im Gegensatz zu הִרְשִׁיעַ (für gottlos oder schuldig erklären) steht.

Das Konkretum צַדִּיק, ein Gerechter, wird mit nur einer Ausnahme stets von Personen ausgesagt, seien es Menschen oder Gott; Deut. 4, 8 wird auch das Gesetz Gottes „ein Gerechtes" genannt; cf. Ps. 19, 10. Ein צַדִּיק ist ein Gerechter, ein Schuldloser, der das Recht, besonders das göttliche Recht und Gesetz, auf seiner Seite hat. Das Wort setzt also voraus, daß es eine Regel, ein Gesetz, eine Norm gibt, nach der der Betreffende schuldlos ist, mit der er verglichen, nach der er beurteilt und mit der er in übereinstimmung erfunden wird. Diese Norm ist für Gott nichts anderes als sein heiliger Wille; für Menschen ist sie das göttliche Gesetz oder auch das im Staat geltende Gesetz, wie aus dem Kontext diese Norm erkannt werden muß.

Ein Gerechter, צַדִּיק, wird dargestellt als ein Mensch, der sich an Gott und sein Gesetz oder Wort hält. So in Ps. 37, 30. 31: „Der Mund des Gerechten redet Weisheit, und seine Zunge spricht Wahrheit. Das Gesetz seines Gottes ist in seinem Herzen; sein Gang wankt nicht." Im ganzen 37. Psalm wird der Gerechte dem Gottlosen, רָשָׁע, gegenübergestellt und der Unterschied in ihrem Wesen und in ihrem Schicksal herausgestellt. So auch in Ps. 34, wo es V. 16 f. heißt: „Die Augen des HErrn [sind gerichtet] auf die Gerechten und seine Ohren auf ihr Hilferufen. Das Angesicht des HErrn [aber ist] wider die übeltäter, bis er ihr Gedächtnis von der Erde ausrottet." Vgl. V. 18—23: „Sie rufen, und der HErr erhört, und aus allen Bedrängnissen errettet er sie. Nahe ist der HErr denen, die zerbrochenen Herzens sind; ja, denen, die zerschlagenen Geistes sind, wird er Heil widerfahren lassen. Viel sind die übel [= Leiden] eines Gerechten, aber aus allen wird der HErr ihn erretten. Der HErr erlöst die Seele seiner Knechte, und es werden nicht schuldig befunden alle, die auf ihn trauen." Man beachte, wie hier ein

Gerechter beschrieben wird als ein solcher, der auf den HErrn traut, sich unter die Gnade Gottes stellt (חסה). Dazu cf. Prov. 18, 10: Der Gerechte läuft in den festen Turm des Namens Jehovahs, nimmt seine Zuflucht zu der in Christo geoffenbarten Gnade des Bundesgottes, und wird beschirmt. Hab. 2, 4: „Der Gerechte wird leben durch seinen Glauben."

Wie ein sündiger Mensch ein Gerechter wird, lehrt uns der HErr besonders deutlich in Ps. 32. Wenn dieser mit den Worten beginnt: „Wohl dem, dessen Untreue (פֶּשַׁע) vergeben ist, dessen Verfehlung (חַטָּאָה) bedecket ist! Wohl dem Menschen, dem Jehovah die Sündenschuld (עָוֹן) nicht zurechnet und in dessen Geist kein Falsch (רְמִיָּה, Unaufrichtigkeit) ist"; ferner, wenn in der Ausführung dieser Gedanken erklärt wird, daß der HErr auf das aufrichtige bußfertige Bekenntnis der Sünde hin „die Schuld der Sünde hinweggenommen habe" (V. 5); wenn ferner erklärt wird, daß jeder Heilige (חָסִיד, Frommer, Begnadigter) den HErrn „darum bitten wird zur Zeit, in der man [Gott] finden kann" (cf. Jes. 55, 6); ferner, wenn der HErr der Bergungsort oder Schirm (סֵתֶר) des Sünders genannt wird — und dieser Schirm ist niemand anders als der Sohn Gottes, der Erlöser —; und endlich mit dem Jubel geschlossen wird: „Freuet euch in Jehovah und seid fröhlich, ihr Gerechten": so ist damit der Werdegang eines „Gerechten" klar vorgezeichnet. Überhaupt schon die Wortform צַדִּיק deutet wohl auf eine ursprünglich passive Bedeutung: „gerechtfertigt, für schuldlos erklärt" (cf. Ps. 51, 6 von Gott).

Die beiden Nomina, die den abstrakten Begriff Gerechtigkeit ausdrücken, sind צֶדֶק und צְדָקָה. Beide Wörter bezeichnen „das Richtige, Korrekte, mit der gegebenen Norm übereinstimmende". So wird z. B. צֶדֶק verbunden mit Waage und als Adjektiv übersetzt „richtige" Waage, Lev. 19, 36. Es bezeichnet ferner „Gerechtigkeit im Sinne von Rechtschaffenheit, Ausüben des Rechts"; Jes. 1, 21: „Jerusalem war voll Recht, Gerechtigkeit wohnte in ihr; nun aber Mörder"; cf. V. 26 „Stadt des Rechts"; Jer. 31, 23 „Wohnung des Rechts". Wo Recht und Gerechtigkeit nebeneinander genannt werden, bezeichnet Recht, מִשְׁפָּט, das Recht an sich, Rechtsurteil, und צֶדֶק das Ausüben desselben. Ist Gott das Subjekt, so wird mit צֶדֶק die göttliche Gerechtigkeit den Menschen gegenüber bezeichnet: Strafgerechtigkeit (Jes. 26, 9: „So wie deine Gerichte die Erde treffen, lernen die Bewohner des Erdkreises Gerechtigkeit"); dann aber besonders auch Heilsgerechtigkeit, daher es häufig neben יֶשַׁע und יְשׁוּעָה (Heil) steht. Deutlich tritt diese Bedeutung hervor Jer. 23, 6: יְהוָה צִדְקֵנוּ „HErr, der unsere Gerechtigkeit ist", und Ps. 4, 2: אֱלֹהֵי צִדְקִי „Gott, der mir zur Gerechtigkeit hilft" (so Gesenius), oder analog Jer. 23, 6 „Gott, der meine Gerechtigkeit ist". Gesenius führt noch Jer. 50, 7 und Ps. 118, 19 an, wo צֶדֶק als synonym mit Gott gebraucht wird: נְוֵה צ' „Wohnung der Gerechtigkeit", und שַׁעֲרֵי צ' „Tore, die zum Heil führen". Der Kontext entscheidet, ob mit צֶדֶק Strafe oder Heil angezeigt wird. So lesen wir Ps. 36, 11: „Bewahre (מְשֹׁךְ, laß andauern) deine Gnade denen, die dich kennen (יָדַע

cum affectu), und deine Gerechtigkeit denen, die aufrichtigen Herzens ſind.“ Hier wird alſo Gottes Gerechtigkeit durch den Parallelismus mit Gnade חֶסֶד, erklärt, wodurch Gottes Gerechtigkeit als Heilsgerechtigkeit beſtimmt wird. — Die Verbindung צִדְקִי in Pſ. 35, 27 iſt zu überſetzen „meine Rechtfertigung“: „Es werden jubeln und ſich freuen, die meine Rechtfertigung gern ſehen, und werden beſtändig ſagen: Der HErr ſei hochgelobt, der das Heil, שְׁלוֹם, ſeines Knechtes will. Und meine Zunge ſoll reden von deiner Gerechtigkeit, allezeit dein Lob.“ Hier treten beide Seiten der göttlichen Gerechtigkeit hervor: ſie dämpft und ſtraft die Widerſacher des Gerechten, während ſie dem Gerechten zum Recht und zum Frieden verhilft.

Von dem Gebrauch und der Bedeutung des Wortes צְדָקָה gilt durchgängig dasſelbe, was über צֶדֶק konſtatiert wurde. Es bedeutet „das Richtige, das Recht, als Objekt von עָשָׂה, tun“. So Gen. 18, 19: „Ich habe ihn [Abraham] erkannt (= erwählt, ידע), auf daß er gebieten ſoll ſeinen Kindern und ſeinem Hauſe nach ihm, daß ſie bewahren den Weg des HErrn, auszuüben Gerechtigkeit und Recht“; cf. Pſ. 15, 2. Ferner von Gott: das rechte Verhalten in bezug auf ſeine Verheißung, Jeſ. 45, 23 f.: „Bei mir ſelbſt habe ich geſchworen, aus meinem Munde iſt ausgegangen eine Gerechtigkeit, eine Verheißung, und ſie wird ſich nicht zurückwenden: daß mir ſich beugen ſoll jedes Knie, jede Zunge ſoll ſchwören: Nur in Jehovah, ſpricht man, iſt für mich Gerechtigkeit, צְדָקָה, und Kraft“; das letztere צְדָקָה bezeichnet natürlich hier die von Jehovah über uns kommende und uns zugerechnete Gerechtigkeit. — Beachtenswert, ja großartig, wie die Lehre von der Rechtfertigung aus Gottes Gnade allein, sola gratia, das ganze Alte Teſtament wie ein Strom lebendigen Waſſers durchfließt!

Sodann, von Menſchen prädiziert, bezeichnet צְדָקָה das rechte Verhalten dem Geſetz gegenüber; cf. Hiob 27, 6. In manchen Stellen umfaßt es „den Begriff der barmherzigen Liebe (zweite Tafel des Geſetzes), was ſpäter ſo in den Vordergrund trat, daß צְדָקָה mit ἐλεημοσύνη wiedergegeben wurde; cf. Sir. 3, 20; Tob. 12, 9; im Neuen Teſtament δικαιοσύνη“, Matth. 6, 1; 2 Kor. 9, 9: Almoſengeben, Mildtätigkeit.

Endlich bezeichnet צְדָקָה „das Richtigſtellen eines Verhältniſſes, Genugtuung, Rechtfertigung“ (Geſenius). Deut. 9, 6: „So ſollſt du erkennen, daß nicht auf Grund deiner Gerechtigkeit Jehovah, dein Gott, dir dies gute Land gibt“, alſo nicht weil Iſrael dem Geſetz genuggetan und ſich ſelbſt als gerecht erwieſen hätte. Dan. 9, 18: „Nicht auf Grund unſerer Gerechtigkeiten [= Genugtuungen] legen wir unſere Gebete nieder vor deinem Angeſicht, ſondern auf Grund deiner großen Barmherzigkeit.“ Joel 2, 23: „Ihr Kinder Zions, jubelt und ſeid fröhlich in dem HErrn, eurem Gott; denn er hat euch gegeben den Lehrer zur Rechtfertigung“ (cf. Geſenius' Wörterbuch), das heißt, der euch lehrt, wie ihr vor Gott gerecht werdet („Regen zur Rechtfertigung“ iſt ein unvollziehbarer Gedanke). Jeſ. 61, 10: „Er hat mich angezogen mit Klei-

dern des Heils und mit dem Rock der Gerechtigkeit bekleidet“; cf. Gal. 3, 27. Mit der Verheißung dieser Heilsgerechtigkeit schließt der HErr den Kanon des Alten Testaments: „Euch aber, die ihr meinen Namen fürchtet, soll aufgehen die Sonne der Gerechtigkeit und Heil unter ihren Flügeln“, Mal. 3, 20. Diese „Sonne der Gerechtigkeit“ ist Christus, Luk. 1, 78 f.

Aus dem bisher Dargelegten können wir summieren:

1. Die in צדק und seinen Derivaten zum Ausdruck kommende Idee ist forensischer, juridischer Natur.

2. Diese Idee setzt ein Gesetz, eine Norm, voraus; denn צדק drückt die Übereinstimmung seines Subjekts mit der Norm aus.

3. Die Gerechtigkeit, mit der wir sündigen Menschen vor Gottes Gericht bestehen können, ist nicht unser eigenes Tun oder Lassen, sondern kommt allein aus Gottes Barmherzigkeit und Gnade, ist von Gott uns bereitet und erworben und wird von Gott, dem höchsten Richter, denen zugesprochen und zugerechnet, die seine Gnadenverheißung in Christo im Glauben ergreifen und darauf vertrauen. — Das Moment der Erwerbung der vor Gott geltenden Gerechtigkeit durch Christum für uns wird in andern Schriftstellen (z. B. Jes. 53; Ps. 69. 22, als satisfactio vicaria) ausdrücklich genannt und erklärt.

4. Die negative Seite der Heilsgerechtigkeit ist die Nichtzurechnung der Sünde, Ps. 32; ihre positive Seite ist die Zurechnung des Verdienstes Christi, Gen. 15, 6; Jes. 61, 10; Ps. 89, 16; 132, 9. 16.

II. Gebrauch und Bedeutung des Wortes Gerechtigkeit in den Psalmen.

Auch in den Psalmen finden wir die allgemeine Unterscheidung, daß die Eigenschaft oder der Besitz der Gerechtigkeit sowohl von Menschen als von Gott ausgesagt wird. In Ps. 4 begegnen wir diesem Begriff zum erstenmal, und zwar in beiden Beziehungen. V. 2 betet der Psalmist: „Wenn ich rufe, so erhöre mich, Gott, der du meine Gerechtigkeit bist! In der Bedrängnis hast du mir Raum verschafft; so sei mir gnädig und erhöre mein Gebet!“ Er nennt also Gott den „Gott seiner Gerechtigkeit“, Gott, der seine Gerechtigkeit ist, genau wie Jer. 23, 6 der HErr unsere Gerechtigkeit genannt wird. Es ist also die von Christo uns erworbene göttliche Heilsgerechtigkeit, die er sich im Glauben zu eigen macht: „*meine* Gerechtigkeit“. Gottes Gerechtigkeit ist *seine* Gerechtigkeit geworden, ihm von Gott aus Gnaden geschenkt, und dadurch hat Gott ihm in seiner Sündenangst und „Bedrängnis Raum verschafft“. Er hat nun ein gutes Gewissen vor Gott, ist mit Gottes Heiligkeit versöhnt und darf deshalb auf Grund dieser ihm zugerechneten Gerechtigkeit mit seinem Gebet vor Gott erscheinen und um weitere Gnadenerweise bitten, um die er Gott angeht. Ehe er dann seine eigentliche Bitte, V. 7 ff., vorträgt, wendet er sich an andere Menschen, die seine „Ehre schmähen und die nach Lügen suchen“, und ermahnt sie: „Opfert Opfer der Gerechtigkeit und vertrauet auf den HErrn!“ Opfer der Gerechtig-

keit ſind nach Geſenius „richtige Opfer“, Opfer, die mit der Norm, dem Willen Gottes, übereinſtimmen, wie ſie Pſ. 51, 18—21 beſchrieben werden. Solche Opfer ſind eine von Menſchen ausgeübte Gerechtigkeit. So bietet uns ſchon Pſ. 4 die beiden Relationen von Gerechtigkeit dar.

Pſ. 5, 9: „HErr, leite mich in deiner Gerechtigkeit um meiner Feinde willen; ebne [mache gerade] deinen Weg vor mir!“ Der Pſalmiſt bittet alſo, der HErr wolle ihn ſo leiten und führen, daß er wandle, wie es vor Gott recht iſt, mit der Norm des göttlichen Willens ſtimmt; cf. Pſ. 86, 11: „Weiſe mir, HErr, deinen Weg“ uſw., Pſ. 139, 24.

Pſ. 7, 9. 18: „Richte mich, o HErr, nach meiner Gerechtigkeit und nach meiner Unſchuld, die über mir iſt. . . . Ich will den HErrn loben gemäß ſeiner Gerechtigkeit.“ Der Pſalmiſt behauptet damit nicht, daß er abſolut, in jeder Beziehung, gerecht und ſchuldlos ſei (cf. Pſ. 143, 2), ſondern daß er in bezug auf eine beſtimmte Sache oder Perſon gerecht, alſo relativ gerecht ſei. Dies lehrt der Kontext; cf. V. 1. Ebenſo iſt Pſ. 18, 21. 25: „Du tuſt mir wohl nach meiner Gerechtigkeit“ zu verſtehen. In gleicher Weiſe beruft ſich auch Hiob in ſeinen Reden auf ſeine Gerechtigkeit, wenn er ſich gegen die Verdächtigungen ſeiner Freunde verteidigt; cf. Hiob 9, 2.

Pſ. 17, 1: „HErr, erhöre die Gerechtigkeit!“ wird erklärt durch den Parallelismus: „mein Gebet, welches nicht von trügeriſchen Lippen kommt“. Es iſt alſo ein rechtes Gebet, ein Gebet „in Wahrheit“, בֶּאֱמֶת, Pſ. 145, 18; Joh. 4, 24; cf. Pſ. 66, 18: „Wenn ich Unrechtes vorhätte in meinem Herzen“ uſw. Pſ. 17, 18: „Ich [aber], in Gerechtigkeit werde ich ſchauen dein Antlitz; ich werde geſättigt werden, wenn ich erwache, von deiner Erſcheinung.“ Auch hier iſt Gerechtigkeit die völlige Übereinſtimmung mit Gottes Idee und Willen, das Ebenbild Gottes. Zu der zweiten Vershälfte (ſynthetiſcher Parallelismus) vgl. Joh. 17, 24; 1 Joh. 3, 2; Hiob 19, 26. 27.

Die Redeweiſe „Seine [ſcil. des Menſchen] Gerechtigkeit bleibet ewiglich“, Pſ. 112, 3. 9; cf. 2 Kor. 9, 9, beſagt, daß Gott ewiglich deſſen gedenken wird, was ein Menſch nach Gottes Willen tut; cf. Matth. 10, 42; Apok. 14, 13.

Dieſe Proben genügen, um darzulegen, wie das Wort Gerechtigkeit von Menſchen prädiziert wird. Im folgenden wollen wir ſolche Ausſagen betrachten, in denen von der Gerechtigkeit Gottes die Rede iſt.

Von der Gerechtigkeit Gottes im allgemeinen, ſcil. als Eigenſchaft und Wirken Gottes, bekennt der Pſalmiſt Pſ. 36, 7: „Deine Gerechtigkeit iſt wie die Berge Gottes; deine Rechtsurteile ſind eine große Tiefe; Menſchen und Vieh willſt du helfen, o HErr.“ Was Gott auch tut, er tut kein Unrecht — לֹא־עָוְלָה בּוֹ (Pſ. 92, 16), wenn auch ſeine Urteile oder Gerichte uns oft unbegreiflich erſcheinen; cf. Pſ. 73, 16 ff.; Röm. 11, 33 ff. So auch Pſ. 111, 3: „Majeſtätiſch und prächtig

ist sein Tun, und seine Gerechtigkeit bestehet ewiglich.“ Hierher gehören auch die Lobsprüche Ps. 119, 142: „Deine Gerechtigkeit ist eine Gerechtigkeit auf ewig; denn dein Gesetz (תּוֹרָתְךָ, Lehre, Wort) ist Wahrheit.“ V. 144: „Die Gerechtigkeit deiner Zeugnisse [bleibt] auf ewig; unterweise mich [darin], auf daß ich leben möge.“ Und V. 160: „Die Summa deines Wortes ist Wahrheit; denn auf ewig [gilt] jedes Urteil deiner Gerechtigkeit.“ Darum preist der Psalmist Gott V. 7: „Ich werde dich loben in Aufrichtigkeit des Herzens, wenn ich lerne die Rechte deiner Gerechtigkeit.“ In diesen Lobsprüchen hat der Psalmist besonders die von Gott kommende Gerechtigkeit des Heils in Christo vor Augen. —

In der Gerechtigkeit Gottes, wie sie sich an den Menschen erweist, unterscheiden wir Strafgerechtigkeit und Heilsgerechtigkeit. Je nach dem Kontext ist zu erforschen und zu erkennen, welche Seite der göttlichen Gerechtigkeit in einer Aussage offenbart oder behandelt wird. Dabei ist aber festzuhalten, daß beide Seiten der Gerechtigkeit Gottes durch dasselbe Wort zum Ausdruck kommen. Schon damit ist angezeigt, daß Strafgerechtigkeit und Heilsgerechtigkeit nicht zwei voneinander verschiedene Gerechtigkeiten in Gott sind; in Gott ist nur eine Gerechtigkeit. Aber Gott offenbart und betätigt seine Gerechtigkeit nach zwei verschiedenen Seiten hin, je nach dem Objekt, mit dem er handelt. Gott hat für die Ausübung seiner Gerechtigkeit zwei Regeln oder Normen aufgestellt: das fordernde Gesetz im eigentlichen engeren Sinn und das gebende Evangelium von seiner Gnade in Christo. Steht ein Mensch unter dem fordernden Gesetz oder stellt er selbst sich darunter, so daß er durch Erfüllung desselben vor Gott gerecht werden will, so handelt Gottes Gerechtigkeit mit ihm nach dem Gesetz. Steht aber ein Mensch unter dem Evangelium, stellt er sich unter die darin geoffenbarte Gnade in Christo, so handelt Gottes Gerechtigkeit mit ihm gemäß der im Evangelium festgesetzten Regel; cf. Röm. 3, 27 „des Glaubens Gesetz“; Jak. 2, 12 „Gesetz der Freiheit“. Der HErr drückt das aus in den Worten: „Prediget das Evangelium aller Kreatur! Wer da glaubet und getauft wird, der wird selig werden; wer aber nicht glaubet, der wird verdammt werden“, Mark. 16. „Wer dem Sohne nicht glaubet“, also das Evangelium von der Gnade Gottes verwirft, „der wird das Leben nicht sehen, sondern der Zorn Gottes bleibt über ihm“, Joh. 3, 36. Es braucht hier nicht weiter ausgeführt zu werden, daß Gott auch dann in Gerechtigkeit handelt, wenn er um der durch unsern lieben Heiland für die Sünden der Menschen vollbrachten Genugtuung willen allen denen die Sünde vergibt und sie für gerecht erklärt, die diese stellvertretende Genugtuung im Glauben ergreifen. Denn der richtenden und vergeltenden Gerechtigkeit und Heiligkeit Gottes ist durch das stellvertretende Tun und Leiden des Sohnes Gottes Genüge geschehen, Röm. 5, 16—18; Gal. 4, 4. 5; 1 Joh. 2, 2. Wenn Gott einem Sünder, der sich unter die im Evangelium geoffenbarte Norm der göttlichen Gerechtigkeit stellt und an diese appelliert, die Sünde vergibt und ihn für

gerecht und schuldlos erklärt, so handelt er also durchaus nach seiner Gerechtigkeit. 2 Tim. 4, 8: Der gerechte Richter wird mir und allen, die seine Erscheinung liebhaben, die Krone der Gerechtigkeit geben. Es ist Gottes unendliche Barmherzigkeit und Gnade, die uns diese Rechtfertigung durch unsern Erlöser JEsum Christum verschafft hat, ohne jegliches Verdienst unsererseits; darum sagt der Apostel: „Wir werden gerechtfertigt geschenkweise, δωρεάν, durch seine Gnade, mittels der Erlösung, die in Christo JEsu vorhanden ist", Röm. 3, 24. Auch in dem Bußgebet Daniels treten beide Phasen der göttlichen Gerechtigkeit klar hervor, Dan. 9, 14. 16.

In den Psalmen sind es unter andern besonders folgende Aussprüche, in denen die strafende oder vergeltende Gerechtigkeit Gottes hervortritt:

Ps. 50, 3: „Es wird kommen unser Gott, und nicht wird er schweigen; fressendes Feuer ist vor ihm, und um ihn her stürmt es gewaltig. Er wird rufen den Himmeln droben und der Erde, um sein Volk zu richten" usw. Im Lichte des Neuen Testaments erkennen wir, daß der Prophet hier das Gericht des Jüngsten Tages weissagt; 2 Petr. 3; 2 Kor. 5, 10.

Ps. 96, 10—13: „Er wird richten die Völker nach dem, was recht ist" (בְּמֵישָׁרִים, in straightness). „Es sollen sich freuen die Himmel, und es soll frohlocken die Erde; es brause das Meer, und was darin ist. Es sei fröhlich das Feld und alles, was darauf ist. Dann sollen jubeln alle Bäume des Waldes vor dem HErrn, denn er ist kommend [ptc. fut.], zu richten die Erde. Er wird richten den Erdkreis mit Gerechtigkeit, בְּצֶדֶק, und die Völker nach seiner Wahrheit." Es ist also der große Tag des Weltgerichts, der hier beschrieben wird, an dem die Kreatur frei werden wird von dem Fluch der Eitelkeit und an dem „er richten wird den Kreis des Erdbodens mit Gerechtigkeit". (Da der Richter Jehovah ist, bietet der Vergleich mit Act. 17, 31 ein Zeugnis für die Gottheit Christi.)

Ebenso wie in Ps. 96 wird das Weltgericht auch in den beiden folgenden Psalmen beschrieben. Ps. 97, 2. 3 lesen wir: „Gerechtigkeit und Recht ist die Grundfeste seines Thrones. Feuer geht vor ihm her und zündet an ringsum seine Feinde." V. 6: „Es werden verkündigen die Himmel seine Gerechtigkeit, und es werden sehen alle Völker seine Herrlichkeit." Und Ps. 98, 6 ff.: „Jauchzet vor dem König Jehovah! Es brause das Meer und was darinnen ist, der Erdkreis und die darauf wohnen! Ströme sollen mit den Händen klappen, zugleich sollen Berge jubeln vor dem HErrn; denn er ist kommend, zu richten die Erde. Er wird richten den Erdkreis mit Gerechtigkeit und die Völker in Geradheit."

Beim Jüngsten Gericht werden beide Seiten der Gerechtigkeit Gottes hervortreten: die strafende Gerechtigkeit wird über die Ungläubigen urteilen und die Heilsgerechtigkeit über die Gläubigen, Matth. 25, 31 ff. Die Norm, nach der gerichtet wird, ist das durch Christum geoffenbarte Wort Gottes, Joh. 12, 48.

Wenden wir uns nun solchen Stellen zu, in denen die Psalmisten besonders von der Heilsgerechtigkeit reden. Allerdings können wir im Rahmen dieser Studie nicht alle betreffenden Aussagen einzeln behandeln; aber eine Auslese wird auch unsern Zweck erfüllen, eine klare Idee von ihr darzubieten. Das Bekenntnis wie die Lehre von der göttlichen Heilsgerechtigkeit ist bei allen Psalmisten dasselbe und zieht sich, wie durch das Alte Testament überhaupt, so auch durch den ganzen Psalter wie ein goldener Faden.

Schon im 1. Psalm ist von den „Gerechten" die Rede: „Die Sünder werden nicht stehen in der Gemeinde der Gerechten. Der HErr erkennt (ידע cum affectu) den Weg der Gerechten." Hier im 1. Psalm wird allerdings der „Wandel, דֶּרֶךְ, der Gerechten" beschrieben; aber ein solch gottgefälliger Wandel findet sich nur bei denen, die die göttliche Heilsgerechtigkeit im Glauben ergriffen haben. Darum bekennt David, wie wir oben sahen, schon im 4. Psalm Gott als seine Gerechtigkeit, auf Grund deren er mit seinem Gebet vor Gott tritt. Woher diese Gerechtigkeit Gottes stammt oder welches ihre verdienstliche Ursache, causa meritoria, ist, lehrt uns dann der HErr selbst Ps. 22, wo er sein stellvertretendes Leiden und Sterben beschreibt und auf Grund dessen er (V. 27 ff.) sagt: „Es werden essen [s. Joh. 6, 58] die Demütigen und werden gesättigt werden; es werden preisen den HErrn, die nach ihm fragen; euer Herz soll ewiglich leben." V. 32: „Sie werden kommen und verkündigen seine Gerechtigkeit dem Volk, das geboren wird, daß Er es vollbracht hat"; cf. Joh. 19, 30. „Seine Gerechtigkeit" ist also die von ihm für uns teuer erworbene Gerechtigkeit, die wir „essen", wovon wir „leben", und zwar „ewiglich". Sie wird im Evangelium allem Volk, das noch bis zum Jüngsten Tage geboren wird, verkündigt.

Trefflich daran anschließend, bekennt dann der Psalmist Ps. 23: „Der HErr ist mein Hirte. . . . Er leitet mich auf den Pfaden der Gerechtigkeit um seines Namens willen." Der HErr erhält und bewahrt also seine Schäflein in seiner Gerechtigkeit (1 Petr. 1, 5), und zwar „um seines Namens willen", wobei mit dem „Namen des HErrn" auf Gottes Offenbarung in Christo hingewiesen wird, also auf seine Verheißung und die in Christo gegebene verdienstliche Ursache der göttlichen Heilsgerechtigkeit; denn nur durch Christum erkennen wir Gottes Namen, das ist, wer und wie er ist; cf. Joh. 1, 18. Sein Name ist Jehovah, der Gott des Gnadenbundes, und in Christo hat er sich uns geoffenbart als יְהוָה צִדְקֵנוּ, Jehovah, der unsere Gerechtigkeit ist, Jer. 23, 6.

Ps. 24, 3 wird die Frage aufgeworfen: „Wer wird hinaufsteigen auf den Berg des HErrn [= Gottes Wohnung], und wer wird stehen an dem Ort seiner Heiligkeit?" Die Antwort lautet: „Wer unschuldige Hände hat und reines Herzens ist; wer seine Seele nicht zum Eitlen [= Götzendienst] erhoben hat und nicht dem Trug [= Götzendienst] zugeschworen hat: der wird Segen von dem HErrn davonbringen und [= nämlich] Gerechtigkeit von dem Gott seines Heils." Wer also in

Christi Blut seine Hände gewaschen, durch den Heiligen Geist ein reines Herz erhalten hat (vgl. Ps. 51, 12) und sich nicht zur Abgötterei und zur falschen Religion wendet, an dem erweist Gott seine Heilsgerechtigkeit. Zur Erklärung wird noch hinzugefügt: „Das ist das Geschlecht derer, die nach ihm [Gott] fragen, die da suchen dein Antlitz, Jakob.“ Hier wird unser HErr JEsus „Jakob“ genannt, der Untertreter, der Satan und alle Feinde unter seine Füße tritt und — V. 7—9 — als „König der Herrlichkeit“ den Thron der Ehren einnimmt. Man beachte hier auch, wie „Gerechtigkeit“ durch „Heil“, יֵשַׁע, erklärt wird.

Ps. 35, 24: „Richte mich nach deiner Gerechtigkeit, o HErr, und laß sie [meine Feinde] sich nicht über mich freuen.“ In solchen Gebeten bittet der Psalmist offenbar nicht, daß Gott nach seiner strafenden Gerechtigkeit mit ihm handeln möge (cf. Ps. 143, 2), sondern nach seiner helfenden und rettenden Gerechtigkeit möge er für ihn eintreten und die Nachstellungen der Feinde vereiteln. In einer gerechten Sache ruft ein Kind Gottes auch die Gerechtigkeit Gottes an, die sich als helfende Heilsgerechtigkeit an Gottes Kindern und als Strafgerechtigkeit an ihren Feinden erweist, Ps. 7, 18; 138, 7. 8.

Ps. 40, 10: „Ich will als frohe Botschaft Gerechtigkeit verkündigen in einer großen Gemeinde. . . . Deine Gerechtigkeit verberge ich nicht in meinem Herzen; von deiner Wahrheit und von deinem Heil rede ich; nicht verhehle ich deine Gnade und deine Wahrheit vor einer großen Gemeinde.“ Wenn wir beachten, daß dieser Psalm ein Gebet des Messias ist, wie Hebr. 10, 5 f. erklärt wird, so erkennen wir auch sofort, daß hier von der seligmachenden, durch Christum für uns erworbenen Gerechtigkeit die Rede ist, die der HErr im Evangelium in und durch seine Gemeinde darbietet. Vgl. V. 7—9 von der Erwerbung dieser Gerechtigkeit durch Christum und hier in V. 10 den Parallelismus von „Gerechtigkeit“ und „Heil“.

Ps. 51, 16 betet der Psalmist: „Errette mich von den Blutschulden, Gott, Gott meines Heils. Meine Zunge möge besingen deine Gerechtigkeit.“ Er bittet also Gott um Errettung von der Schuld, die auf ihm liegt und ihn zur Hölle verdammt. Er nennt Gott den Gott seines Heils, seiner Rettung, ebenso wie er ihn Ps. 4, 2 den Gott seiner Gerechtigkeit nennt. Wie und weil Gott selbst seine (des Sünders) Gerechtigkeit ist, so und deshalb ist er auch seine Rettung, יְשׁוּעָה. Hier ist Luk. 2, 30 zu vergleichen, wo Simeon das JEsuskindlein mit dem Abstraktum τὸ σωτήριόν σου, dein Heil, bezeichnet, also in ihm den Gott, der sein Heil ist, erkennt. Die Rettung des Sünders von Sündenschuld und Verdammnis besteht also darin, daß Gott sein Heil ist und seine Sünde tilgt; cf. V. 3: „Tilge [lösche, wische aus] meine Untreue nach deiner großen Barmherzigkeit!“ Wenn er sodann betet: „Es möge besingen meine Zunge deine Gerechtigkeit“, so ist es also die rettende, seligmachende Tätigkeit der Gerechtigkeit Gottes, die seine Sünde tilgt, die ihn von den Blutschulden errettet und die er besingen und bekennen will,

wie er dann fortfährt: „HErr, tue meine Lippen auf, daß mein Mund dein Lob verkündige!“ Nur dann kann der Sünder dem HErrn ein Loblied singen, wenn Gottes Gerechtigkeit seine Sünde aus seinem Schuldbuch ausgelöscht hat; cf. Ps. 6, 6.

Ps. 45 ist eine messianische Weissagung, wie nicht allein aus dem Inhalt, sondern auch aus dem Zeugnis des Neuen Testaments erkannt wird; denn Hebr. 1 werden die Worte „Du liebest Gerechtigkeit und hassest gottloses Wesen, darum [daß] dich, o Gott, dein Gott gesalbet hat mit Freudenöl mehr als deine Genossenschaft“ als von Christo handelnd zitiert. Wenn hier Gerechtigkeit und Gottlosigkeit in Kontraposition stehen, so bezeichnet Gerechtigkeit das Tun dessen, was dem Willen Gottes gemäß ist; cf. Matth. 3, 15: πληρῶσαι πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην. Von Christo wird nun V. 5 ausgesagt: „Es soll dir gelingen in deinem Schmuck; fahre einher für die Wahrheit und die Milde der Gerechtigkeit, und es wird dich deine rechte Hand ehrfurchtgebietende Dinge lehren.“ Die Milde der Gerechtigkeit, עֲנָוָה־צֶדֶק, ist ohne Zweifel nicht strafende Gerechtigkeit, sondern Heilsgerechtigkeit. Mit „Wahrheit“, אֱמֶת, wird Gottes Wort, besonders das Evangelium von dem Heil in Christo, bezeichnet; cf. Joh. 1, 17: „Gnade und Wahrheit ist durch JEsum Christum geworden“; Joh. 17, 16. 17. In Ps. 45 wird also der Messias als der Bringer und Verkündiger der heilbringenden Gerechtigkeit geweissagt. Man achte hier auf die wunderbare Parallele mit Joh. 1, 17: Gnade und Wahrheit — Wahrheit und Gerechtigkeitsmilde, wodurch die Heilsgerechtigkeit als aus der Gnade Gottes fließend dargestellt wird.

Ps. 48, 10. 11: „Wir gedenken, o Gott, deiner Gnade inmitten deines Tempels. Wie dein Name, o Gott, so ist dein Lob bis an die Enden der Welt; mit Gerechtigkeit ist erfüllt deine Hand.“ Der Psalmist sagt, daß „wir Gottes gedenken“ in den Gottesdiensten. Aber sein Lob ist nicht auf Israel beschränkt; soweit man seinen Namen, seine Offenbarung in Christo, kennt, bis an die Enden der Erde, so weit lobt und preist man ihn, und zwar weil seine „rechte Hand erfüllt ist mit Gerechtigkeit“, weil er in Christo die Gerechtigkeit darbietet und austeilt, die vor ihm gilt, womit arme Sünder vor ihm bestehen können. Wer diese Heilsgerechtigkeit noch nicht kennt, der lobt und preist Gott noch nicht, sondern muß noch knechtische Furcht vor ihm als dem Richter haben. „Das Gesetz richtet nur Zorn an“, Röm. 4, 15.

Ps. 65, 6: „Wunderbar wolltest du uns beschenken mit Gerechtigkeit, Gott, der du unser Heil bist; der du bist Zuversicht aller Enden der Erde, ja auch der fernen Meeresinseln.“ Zur Erklärung dieser Übersetzung sei bemerkt, daß das Wort „wunderbar“, נוֹרָאוֹת, ptc. f. pl., hier als Adverb zu werten ist. Es bedeutet ursprünglich „furchtbar, ehrfurchtgebietend“ (von יָרֵא, fürchten), ist aber schon von den LXX mit θαυμαστός, „wunderbar“, wiedergegeben, wohl weil die Wunder Gottes ehrfurchterweckend sind. Die LXX übersetzen die erste Vershälfte: „Als Wunderbarer in Gerechtigkeit erhöre uns.“ Jedoch Gesenius sagt, daß

עָנָה mit folgendem ב hier bezeichnet „mit etwas, nämlich mit Gerechtigkeit, beschenken“. „Heil“, יֵשַׁע, wird in der Septuaginta als Konkretum mit σωτήρ, Heiland, ganz sinngemäß wiedergegeben. Welche Übersetzung wir aber auch bevorzugen mögen, der Sinn ist allemal derselbe. Daß hier der Psalmist um die sündenvergebende Gerechtigkeit bittet, geht auch schon hervor aus den vorhergehenden Worten: „Du erhöreſt Gebet; darum darf alles Fleisch zu dir kommen. Die Anklagen der Missetaten sind mir zu stark geworden; unsere Untreue wolleſt du selbst bedecken“, תְּכַפְּרֵם, sühnen. Daß der Prophet hier auf das sühnende, sündenbedeckende Blut unsers großen Hohenpriesters schaut, das durch die Sündopfer symbolisiert war, steht außer allem Zweifel.

Von der rechtfertigenden Heilsgerechtigkeit Gottes handeln ferner Ps. 69, 28; 71, 2. 15. 16. 19. 24 (V. 16: „Ich preise deine Gerechtigkeit, dich allein“); Ps. 85, 11. 12; 88, 13: „Wird erkannt werden in der Finsternis [Matth. 8, 12] dein Wunderwerk und deine Gerechtigkeit im Lande des Vergessenseins?“ So auch Ps. 119, 40: „Erquicke mich [= belebe mich] durch deine Gerechtigkeit“; V. 123: „Meine Augen sind verzehrt nach deinem Heil und nach dem Wort deiner Gerechtigkeit“; V. 164: „Siebenmal des Tages rühme ich dich wegen der Urteile deiner Gerechtigkeit.“ Ps. 143. Dieser Bußpsalm beginnt mit der Bitte: „HErr, erhöre mein Gebet, laß deine Ohren merken auf mein Flehen; um deiner Treue willen beschenke mich mit deiner Gerechtigkeit.“ Mit der Berufung auf Gottes Treue hält er Gott seine Verheißungen vor (denn Gottes Treue, אֱמֶת, besteht darin, daß er sein Wort hält). Hier gebraucht der Beter wieder, wie Ps. 65, 5, עָנָה mit folgendem ב, „mit etwas beschenken, etwas gewähren, to grant something“. Er bittet also um die Gerechtigkeit, mit der er vor Gott bestehen und die allein Gott ihm gewähren kann. Dies zeigt auch die darauffolgende Bitte: „Gehe nicht ins Gericht mit deinem Knecht; denn vor dir ist kein Lebendiger gerecht.“

Wir schließen diesen Überblick mit den Worten: „Den Lobpreis deiner großen Güte soll man verkündigen (hervorsprudeln lassen, יַבִּיעוּ), und deine Gerechtigkeit soll man besingen“, Ps. 145, 7. Ja, es ist die unendliche Güte und Barmherzigkeit Gottes, in der er uns die vor ihm geltende Gerechtigkeit durch seinen lieben Sohn, unsern Heiland JEsum Christum, verschafft hat, die er uns im Evangelium darreicht und gemäß seiner Verheißung allen denen anrechnet, die wie Abraham sein Wort im Glauben aufnehmen und darauf vertrauen. Und dieser Überblick lehrt uns, daß die gläubigen Kinder Gottes im Alten Bunde genau denselben Begriff von der göttlichen Heilsgerechtigkeit hatten, den uns das Neue Testament darbietet und den wir, Gottes Kinder im Neuen Bunde, im Glauben festhalten. Unter dieser „Sonne der Gerechtigkeit“, Mal. 3, 20, wollen wir durch Gottes Gnade leben, sterben und selig werden.

Wheaton, Ill. L. A. Heerboth.

Der Schriftgrund für die Lehre von der satisfactio vicaria.

(Fortsetzung.)

10. Christus hat sein Blut für uns vergossen.

Matth. 26, 28: Das ist mein Blut des Neuen Testaments, welches vergossen wird für viele zur Vergebung der Sünden.

Mark. 14, 24: Und er sprach zu ihnen: Das ist mein Blut des Neuen Testaments, das für viele vergossen wird.

Luk. 22, 20: Desselbigengleichen auch den Kelch nach dem Abendmahl und sprach: Das ist der Kelch, das Neue Testament in meinem Blut, das für euch vergossen wird. Vgl. 1 Kor. 11, 25.

Der Kontext, in dem sich diese Worte in den Synoptikern finden, ist bekannt. Der Heiland hatte zum letzten Male das Passahmahl mit seinen Jüngern gefeiert. Er hatte den gewöhnlichen Gang der Mahlzeit beobachtet, wie dieser in den Vorschriften des Alten Testaments und in den Überlieferungen des jüdischen Volkes vorgesehen war. Die Fußwaschung war geschehen; das bittere Gemüse, die Passahsoße, die ungesäuerten Brote, das geröstete Lamm: alles war aufgetragen und nach den überlieferten Regeln genossen worden. Und somit war das eigentliche Mahl zu Ende gekommen, vor dem Trinken des dritten Bechers, dem ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας. Hier nun, μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι, nach Beschluß der eigentlichen Passahmahlzeit, war der Zeitpunkt gekommen, den der Heiland für die Einsetzung des neutestamentlichen Sakraments ersehen hatte. Er nahm zunächst das Brot, sprach darüber den üblichen Segen aus und teilte dann die Stücke an seine Jünger aus.

Und nun folgt der Bericht von dem zweiten Element im heiligen Abendmahl und seiner Bedeutung. Wie JEsus zuerst das Brot genommen hatte, so nahm er nun ebenfalls den Kelch. Und von diesem Kelch, das heißt, von dem Inhalt dieses Kelches, sprach er zu seinen Jüngern: Dies ist der Kelch, dies ist mein Blut des neuen Testaments. Im Alten Testament hatte Gott auch Blut als Zeichen seines Bundes mit dem Volke gebraucht, nicht nur in den regelmäßigen Opfern Tag für Tag, sondern auch schon in der Weihung des Volkes Israel zum Volk des Eigentums. Denn nachdem Moses das Buch des Bundes genommen und es vor den Ohren des Volkes gelesen hatte, nahm er Blut und sprengte das Volk damit und sprach: „Sehet, das ist das Blut des Bundes, den der HErr mit euch machte über allen diesen Worten", Ex. 24, 7. 8. Vgl. Hebr. 9, 20.

Das Blut JEsu also, das im heiligen Abendmahl in, mit und unter dem Wein dargereicht und empfangen wird, ist das Blut des neuen Testaments, des neuen Bundes. Eben von diesem Blute aber spricht der

Heiland klar und deutlich: das an eurer Statt vergossene, das um vieler willen vergossen ist zur Vergebung der Sünden, das vergossen ist an vieler Statt. Hier wird die stellvertretende Genugtuung des Heilandes auf das klarste und entschiedenste dargelegt. Matthäus hat περὶ πολλῶν, wo πολλοί nach Schriftgebrauch „die vielen" oder „alle" bedeutet. Markus hat ὑπὲρ πολλῶν, und die hier gebrauchte Präposition bestätigt die Annahme, daß wir es hier mit einer vollen und adäquaten Stellvertretung zu tun haben. Und Lukas setzt ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, wodurch die Anwendung direkt auf die Jünger gemacht wird, die das Mahl des HErrn genossen.

Das ist der Trost des Neuen Testaments, des Evangeliums. Das ist die Zentrallehre des Christentums, daß das Blut des Heilandes nicht nur uns zugute, zu unserm Besten, vergossen worden ist, sonderlich in seinem großen Leiden, in Gethsemane und auf Golgatha, sondern daß er dies Blut vergossen hat an unserer Statt, an aller Menschen Statt, daß er die Strafe erduldet hat, die wir hätten erdulden sollen, daß er als unser Stellvertreter in den Tod gegangen ist.

Und dieser Trost wird noch vertieft durch die Aussage, die Matthäus aufgezeichnet hat: zur Vergebung der Sünden. Ohne Einschränkung und Rückhalt steht der Text da: εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. Alles, was Sünde heißt, und alle Sünden, wo sie sich auch finden, sind in diesem Trostwort eingeschlossen. Christi Versöhnungstat, die Vergießung seines Blutes an der Menschen Statt, an unserer Statt, hat die Vergebung, die Erlassung der Sünden, aller Sünden, bewirkt. die völlige Vergebung der Sünden ist mit dem Opfertode Christi, mit der Vergießung seines Blutes gegeben: die Rechtfertigung der ganzen Sünderwelt liegt jetzt vor aller Welt bereit.

1 Joh. 1, 7: Wenn wir aber in dem Lichte wandeln, wie er selber ist in dem Licht, Gemeinschaft haben wir miteinander, und das Blut JEsu, seines Sohnes, reinigt uns von aller Sünde.

Trotzdem der Schwerpunkt dieses Beweisspruches für uns im zweiten Teil des Verses liegt, so ist doch auch der erste Teil für den Gedankengang wichtig. Wie im ersten Kapitel seines Evangeliums, stellt auch hier der Apostel Johannes Licht und Finsternis in scharfen Gegensatz zueinander. Wie Gott die Quelle alles wahren Lichtes ist, so ist auch in JEsu das Licht und das wahre geistliche Leben. Außer JEsu ist nur Finsternis. Deshalb liegt auch von Natur jeder Mensch in der Finsternis, und alle Ungläubigen leben in der Finsternis und der Blindheit ihrer Gottentfremdung. Von den Gläubigen dagegen gilt, daß sie kraft der Wiedergeburt im Lichte sind und im Lichte wandeln, weil Gott selber, der im Anfang sprach: „Es werde Licht", in unsere Herzen einen hellen Schein gegeben hat, daß durch uns nun entstünde die Erleuchtung von der Erkenntnis der Klarheit Gottes in dem Angesichte JEsu Christi, 2 Kor. 4, 6. Unser Wandel im Licht ist demnach ein Anzeichen und Be-

weis unserer Gemeinschaft mit Gott und Christo. Aber eben weil alle Christen in demselben Verhältnis zu ihrem Heiland stehen, darum sind sie Glieder des Leibes Christi und stehen in Gemeinschaft miteinander. Das ist in kurzen Zügen der Gedanke des ersten Versteiles.

Neben diese Aussage stellt nun aber der Apostel eine zweite, die auf die ganze Stellung der Christen in ihrem Verhältnis zu Gott und zu ihren Mitchristen das rechte Licht wirft. Er schreibt: Das Blut JEsu [Christi fehlt in den besseren Texten] reinigt uns. Er redet demnach vom Blut JEsu, des Erlösers und Seligmachers, nicht an sich als Flüssigkeit, sondern als Versöhnungsblut, weil Johannes eben die Tatsache der Lebenshingabe Christi für uns betonen will. JEsus, der Heiland, hat sein Blut, sein Leben, dahingegeben, geopfert. Dabei liegt Wert und Bedeutung dieses Opfertodes in der Tatsache, daß er der Sohn Gottes ist, nicht im sekundären Sinn, wie auch wir durch den Glauben Gottes Kinder werden und kraft solcher Annahme zu Kindern die Gotteskindschaft haben, wie der Apostel Gal. 3 und 4 ausführt. Der Ausdruck τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ zeigt, daß es sich hier um die wesentliche Gotteskindschaft handelt. Ps. 2, 7. Er, den der Vater von Ewigkeit gezeugt hat, der in eminentem Sinn sein Sohn, sein geliebter Sohn ist, der im Schoße der Jungfrau Maria des wahren menschlichen Fleisches und Blutes teilhaftig geworden ist, der hat sein Blut in den Tod gegeben, der hat sich für die Menschen geopfert. Das ist es, was in dem Versöhnungstod Christi in der Wagschale lag: nicht nur das Blut JEsu, des Propheten von Nazareth, des Sohnes der Maria, sondern das Blut des großen Gottessohnes; denn kraft der Gemeinschaft der Naturen überträgt die Schrift die Eigenschaften der menschlichen Natur auf die göttliche.

Um dieses unvergleichlichen Wertes willen, der in dem Opfer des Gottessohnes liegt, war es möglich und ist es tatsächlich geschehen, daß das Blut JEsu reinigt, καθαρίζει. Er spricht nicht „hat gereinigt", als ob wir nur die einmalige geschichtliche Begebenheit zu bedenken hätten, sondern „reinigt", macht rein, weil die Reinigung durch das Blut JEsu nicht bloß eine einmalige, sondern eine fortdauernde Wirkung hat. Gerade diese Betonung ist nötig, um die volle Tragweite der Aussage zu verstehen; denn ausdrücklich schreibt der Apostel: von aller Sünde. Er setzt nicht den Artikel, sondern will gleichsam in alles umfassender Weise die Zusicherung geben: Alle und jede Sünde, alles, was Sünde heißt in, an und unter den Menschen, ist hinweggetan, ist weggewaschen durch das Blut des Heilandes. Wie der Gnadenwille Gottes allgemein ist und über die ganze Welt geht, so ist die Versöhnung, die durch JEsum Christum geschehen ist, allgemein: sie umfaßt alle Sünder und alle Sünden.

Und der große Trost des Verses liegt sonderlich für jeden, der die Versöhnung predigt, in dem Worte uns, ἡμᾶς. Gerade wir, die wir diese Botschaft hören, wir, die wir zur Erkenntnis unserer Sünden ge-

kommen ſind, wir, die den Verſöhnungstod Chriſti kennen, wir haben die Verſöhnung durch Chriſti Blut und Tod, wir haben die Reinigung von unſern Sünden, Hebr. 1, 7, wir haben die Erlöſung durch ſein Blut, die Vergebung der Sünden. P. E. K.

Sermon Study for the Third Sunday after Trinity.

Acts 3, 1—16.

(Eisenach Epistle-lesson.)

With a few strokes of his pen, Luke had in the preceding verses presented an accurate picture of the life and activities of the early Christian Church. Peacefully and undisturbed by the enemies of Christ, the apostles went about their daily duty of preaching and performing wonders and signs. In chapter 3 Luke singles out one of these miracles, which gave to two of the apostles a special opportunity to proclaim the Gospel before a vast assembly and which was the occasion for the first open opposition on the part of the leaders of the people, chap. 4, 1. As in his entire book, Luke here shows his mastery in vivid and exact description. We have here a word-picture, painted with marvelous skill by a master artist. The closer we study this passage, the more vividly will the whole scene be reenacted before our eyes.

Now, Peter and John went up together into the Temple at the hour of prayer, being the ninth hour, v. 1. Peter and John undoubtedly were friends before they had met Jesus, but their friendship had grown the more intimate and tender, it had been sanctified and hallowed, ever since they had found in Jesus of Nazareth the Messiah, the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world, John 1, 29 f. These two friends had been granted special honors by their Lord; cf. Mark 5, 37; 9, 2. In the solemn hours preceding the death of their beloved Master their hearts had become knitted together still closer, especially since again the Lord, perhaps in recognition of their loyal friendship, had assigned to them special duties and granted them special privileges, Mark 13, 3; Luke 22, 8; John 13, 23. 24; Mark 14, 33; cf. also John 18, 16. After the resurrection they remained united in loyal friendship, John 20, 1—10; 21, 2. 7. 20. 21. These two inseparable friends "went up together into the Temple," ascended the Temple hill, which was the highest of the hills on which Jerusalem was built. With them went invisibly their mutual Friend, Jesus, Matt. 18, 20 and 28, 20, leading their steps, so shaping events as to give them an opportunity to bring physical and spiritual health and happiness to a poor unfortunate and to break the Bread of Life to a large assembly of fellow-men. It was the hour of prayer that called them into the Temple, the ninth hour, about three o'clock in

the afternoon. The Jews had three hours of public prayer (cp. Dan. 6, 10), to all of which reference is made in the Book of Acts: the early hour of prayer, at the time of the morning sacrifice, about nine o'clock, Acts 2, 15; the noon hour (sixth), Acts 10, 9; and the evening prayer in connection with the offering of incense at the evening sacrifice, which began at about 2.30 and lasted for an hour and a half. Peter and John still clung to the old Jewish customs, endeared to them by lifelong habit. They were not iconoclasts, no Carlstadts and Muenzers, ruthlessly breaking with time-honored customs. Though these customs were no longer commanded by God or had never been instituted by Him; though even the divinely appointed rites — shadows of things to come — had now lost much of their significance, since the body had come in Christ, yet they were good and venerable customs, offering opportunity to go up with the people of God to praise His holy name, Ps. 42, 4; Ps. 122. While we watch them "going up" (note the descriptive imperfect ἀνέβαινον), making the ascent to the Temple, there is another man approaching the house of God.

And a certain man, lame from his mother's womb, was carried, whom they laid daily at the gate of the Temple which is called Beautiful to ask alms of them that entered into the Temple, v. 2. This man was not walking up the Temple hill like Peter and John; he was being carried, the imperfect again very vividly presenting the scene before our eyes. We see a poor unfortunate, a man lame from his mother's womb, for more than forty years (4, 22) afflicted with an incurable malady. Impossible it was for him to walk or stand, impossible to gain a livelihood from any work or profession which demanded any ability to move about. He was obliged to rely for his sustenance on his fellow-men, on his friends, relatives, and acquaintances. Finally, it seems, he became an object of public charity. Friends or acquaintances, at times willingly, at times grudgingly, performed their onerous duty. So on this afternoon also he was being brought to the Temple at the same time that Peter and John were on their way there. He was no longer a stranger there, rather a familiar figure, recognized by all the people even after his cure, Acts 3, 10; 4, 22. Luke informs us that day by day he was placed at the gate of the Temple which is called "the Beautiful." Opinions vary as to the identity of this gate. Dalman, an authority in these matters, identifies it with the Corinthian Gate of Josephus and locates it somewhere on the eastern side of the Court of the Women, the exact location being impossible to determine. (G. Dalman, *Orte und Wege Jesu,* p. 241.) Barton is uncertain whether this gate is meant or the gate leading from the Women's Court to the Court of Israel. (Barton, *Archeology and the Bible,* pp. 256. 260.) The purpose of the friends of the lame man in placing him at this gate and his purpose

of coming to the Temple was altogether different from that of the apostles. They came to worship, to pray, to give honor to God; he came to beg, as Luke puts it, "to ask alms of them that entered into the Temple." The present participle, εἰσπορευομένων, effectively pictures the streams of people as they were going into the house of God. They came to ask mercy from their God; how many will have mercy on him who asks for alms? The very word used by Luke, also its Hebrew equivalent, reminds the almsgiver that his gift was to be given with a merciful heart, in gratitude to God for that divine mercy which he hoped to receive in so abundant a measure in the Temple; and to give these alms not in a haughty manner, making the poor man painfully aware and ashamed of his misery, but in that warm-hearted, cordial spirit of sincere sympathy and affection which, like God, gives unaffectedly, willingly, liberally; cf. Jas. 1, 5; 1 John 3, 17. 18; Is. 58, 7.

Who, seeing Peter and John about to go into the Temple, asked an alms, v. 3. Peter and John are among the vast throngs crowding through the gates. The man sees them as they are on the point of going into the Temple. Why does his glance fall upon them just at this moment? Why does he single out just these two? Certainly they had not made the impression of being rich. Was it perhaps that they were the first to pass him after he had been placed at the gate? Or was there something in their appearance and expression that encouraged the poor man to ask just them, because he knew intuitively that he would not be refused? We cannot tell. We know, however, that the Lord caused his eye to fall upon these two. The Lord caused him to appeal to them for help. And the Lord did this that His own name might be glorified, cf. John 9, 3, and that this poor man might be cured in body and soul. The man asked (ἠρώτα). Again the imperfect describes continued and repeated action. Luke means to describe the insistence, bordering upon impudence, which unfortunately characterizes many public beggars. He asked to receive alms. That is uppermost in his mind, the chief, if not the only, purpose why he came to the Temple.

And Peter, fastening his eyes upon him with John, said, Look on us, v. 4. Filled with pity and the desire to help this man and to glorify their Savior, Peter and John fix their eyes upon the man, gaze on him steadily, and tell him, "Look on us." They are trying to rouse him out of his lethargy and despondency to gain his interest and attention.

And he gave heed unto them, expecting to receive something from them, v. 5. He is willing to do anything he is asked to do as long as he may hope to receive a gift. He was disappointed in his expectation of receiving an alms.

Then Peter said, Silver and gold have I none; but such as

I have give I thee: In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth rise up and walk, v. 6. Peter and John had no money, else they would have handed him a gift unsolicited. But what Peter had he was willing to give. Here is true communism, not the willingness and demand to take what belongs to others, rather the willingness to share with our fellow-men, to give to others what we have and enjoy. A wonderful gift Peter had, more valuable than a mere dole, far more welcome to this lame man than even a rich gift of silver and gold. "In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth rise up and walk." There were few, if any, of the inhabitants of Jerusalem that did not know this name, Luke 24, 13; Acts 2, 5. 6. 14. 43. Undoubtedly the lame man was acquainted with the events that had stirred Jerusalem during the last months. The term *Nazarene,* or, as Luke writes here, *Nazoraios,* is frequently used to denote Christ's humble origin; cp. John 1, 46. To many indeed Jesus was no more than "the Nazarene," the despised Rabbi from Galilee. To others He was a Christ, a Messiah, not the God-appointed Messiah of the word of prophecy, but a Messiah of their own making, according to their own preconceived ideas. To Peter He was above all Jesus, the Savior, a Savior who had not come in His own authority, who was indeed *the Christ,* invested not with human authority only, but endowed with divine power and majesty. Of this divine power dwelling still in Jesus though He was no longer visibly on earth Peter is about to give an incontrovertible proof. In the authority and by the command of Jesus, Mark 16, 17, Peter gives to the poor man the ability not merely to rise and remain standing (aorist imperative), but a better gift, the power to walk about, to be walking (present imperative). Nor does Peter merely command the lame man to do what to him must have seemed impossible, he proves his own utter confidence in the power of Jesus, in whose name and as whose representative he had issued the command, by grasping the hand of the lame man and lifting him up, the imperfect describing the act of slowly lifting him off the earth into a standing position. By this friendly gesture, Peter encouraged the lame man to do what he was told, even though it may have for a moment seemed to him foolish, impossible. The effect of Peter's word and action is wonderful and immediate. In one instant the feet and ankle bones of the lame man received strength. For the first time in forty years could he make use of them. Leaping up in response to Peter's word and urgent grasp, he stands, stands unsupported. He walks. He does not stumble, fall, collapse; he must not slowly and laboriously learn to walk; there is not a trace of his lifetime ailment left. Note how insistently Luke stresses this, v. 8 (twice): v. 9. 12. 16; 4, 14. 16. 22. Together with Peter and John he enters the Temple, *walking,* — what a sensation, what a joy that must have been to him! — leaping, jumping in sheer exuberance of happi-

ness and, last but not least, *praising God.* A cure of body and soul had been effected. He did not superstitiously venerate Peter and John. As he had believed Peter's word "Rise up and walk," so he believed and knew that Peter's other words were true, that the miracle was done in the name of Jesus Christ, that to Jesus above all he owed his health; and to Jesus, the Son of God, he at once paid his debt of gratitude. How many Christians will give due credit to physicians, etc., but are afraid, ashamed, publicly or even privately, to praise the name of Him who is the Great Physician of body and soul.

And all the people saw him walking and praising God; and they knew that it was he which sat for alms at the Beautiful Gate of the Temple; and they were filled with wonder and amazement at that which had happened unto him, vv. 9. 10. The strange behavior of the formerly lame man naturally attracted the attention of all present. Gradually one after the other recognized him, knew him, the iterative imperfect describing a series of acts. We can hear them voice their astonishment. "Why, this is the very one who was sitting at the Beautiful Gate for alms." There was no doubt as to his identity. Not only did he proclaim it in his song of praise, their own eyes assured them that the same man who had for many years been known to be incurably lame now walked and jumped about. "How is that possible?" They were filled with *wonder,* θάμβος, that amazement, bordering on terror, caused by the novelty, unexpectedness, inexplicability of a happening; *amazement,* ἔκστασις, a throwing of the mind out of its normal state, a blending of fear and wonder. They realized that here more than human power had been manifested. Whence had these men obtained such power?

And as the lame man which was healed held Peter and John, all the people ran together unto them in the porch that is called Solomon's, greatly wondering, v. 11. Had Peter and John intended to pass out of the Temple quietly and unobserved? If so, that was very effectively prevented by the healed man. He held, clung to, the apostles, as though fearing to be separated from them, and in so doing very efficiently served as their publicity agent. For, while he was clinging to them (note the present participle), there took place a concourse of the people toward the porch that is called Solomon's, all wondering, ἔκθαμβοι, terrified, thoroughly amazed, the verb form being used of the terror of Jesus in Gethsemane, Mark 14, 33, and of the women at the open grave, Mark 16, 5. Luke purposely uses very strong expressions to describe the deep impression made upon all the people by this miracle. — The Porch of Solomon was one of the covered halls, or colonnades, surrounding the Court of the Gentiles and serving as convenient places for public meetings and discussions. Solomon's Porch ran along the eastern wall of the Temple, facing the

Beautiful Gate. According to Josephus (*Ant.*, XX, 9. 7) it was a part of Solomon's Temple left intact in the destruction by Nebuchadnezzar, 586 B. C., a magnificent portico, whose roof was supported by a double row of pillars 38 feet high. Here Jesus had taught, John 10, 23; here the first Christian congregation assembled, Acts 5, 12.

And when Peter saw it, he answered unto the people, Ye men of Israel, why marvel ye at this, or why look ye so earnestly on us as though by our own power or holiness we had made this man to walk? V. 12. "Ye men of Israel"; cp. Acts 2, 22; 5, 35; 13, 16; 21, 18. An honorable address. Israel was the name given by God Himself to their great ancestor, Gen. 32, 28; a title of honor, cp. Ex. 22; 14, 30. 31; Hos. 11, 1; Rom. 9, 4; 11, 1. Such a *captatio benevolentiae* is not at all out of place if it proceeds not from a spirit of flattery and man-service, but is made for the purpose of calling attention to the truth, in order to gain the good will of one's audience. See the opening words of Paul's epistles. To Israel had been given the promise, and that these Israelites might receive the fulness of what this promise involved was the purpose of Peter's speech, that they be Israelites not only according to the flesh, 1 Cor. 10, 18, but according to the spirit, the Israel of God, Gal. 6, 16. Let us learn from Peter to gain the good will of our congregations by calling their attention to their God-given privileges. "Why marvel ye at this?" What a bold statement! To Peter this healing, which caused the people to be amazed, to get beside themselves, was nothing to marvel at. It was to him a matter of course. The reason he gives presently. First he rejects any honor that might accrue to him and John. "Or why look ye so earnestly on us, as though by our own power," power inherent in us, as men, "or holiness," piety, fear of God, "had made this man to walk?" The cause for this miracle is not to be sought in us. Note the emphasis placed on "us," "own power or holiness" by their position at the beginning of the clauses. All glory belongs solely to God, Ps. 115, 1.

The God of Abraham and of Isaac and of Jacob, the God of our fathers, hath glorified His Son Jesus, whom ye delivered up and denied Him in the presence of Pilate when he was determined to let him go. But ye denied the Holy One and the Just and desired a murderer to be granted unto you; and killed the Prince of Life, whom God hath raised from the dead, whereof we are witnesses, vv. 13—15. The apostles are not preaching a new religion, another God. They are not radicals, liberals, but conservatives in the best sense of the term, conserving the unity of faith as revealed by God Himself in His holy Word. Their God is the same God as that of Israel, of the fathers and patriarchs, the one and only true God, besides whom there is no God, Ex. 3, 15. 16. Your God, the God of your fathers, our God, has glorified His Son Jesus, ἐδόξασε τὸν παῖδα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν.

The word παῖς is used in the LXX very frequently in translating the term *servant.* In fact, the words of Peter here are almost the exact reproduction of Is. 52, 13: ὁ παῖς μου . . . δοξασθήσεται. Peter publicly declares that Jesus is that Servant who according to this word of prophecy was glorified after deepest humiliation, that Servant upon whom the Lord had laid the iniquity of us all, by whose stripes we are healed, Is. 53, 5. 6. Far from preaching a new doctrine, unheard of in Israel, Peter simply proclaimed the fulfilment of God's well-known promises to Israel in the very words of that ancient prophecy. His preaching is saturated with Old Testament phraseology. God's Servant, that lowly Nazarene, v. 6, has been glorified. Before he shows the manner of God's glorification of His Servant, Peter points out the shameful manner in which Israel had dishonored that self-same Servant, Jesus. Five charges he raises against the people, a five-fold cord placed round about their necks, each strand a fetter unbreakable, unescapable for them, winding itself round about them, strangling them, dragging them down ever deeper into death and damnation. That Servant, whom God glorified, "ye delivered up," παρεδώκατε, the same word used by the evangelists of Judas's betrayal, Matt. 26, 15, etc.; of the delivering of Jesus to Pilate by the Jews, Matt. 27, 2; of the delivering of Jesus to the Jews by Pilate to be crucified, John 19, 16. Him whom God glorified they delivered up. More than that; you *denied* Him, did not want to know Him nor acknowledge Him as your Messiah, as the Servant prophesied in Is. 53. You denied Him *before Pilate,* before his face, audaciously, shamelessly, though he had determined, decided, and publicly announced his intention, to set him free, Luke 23, 16; John 19, 4. But ye, in shameful contrast to this ignorant heathen, ye denied *the Holy One and Just.* That is the third charge. Ἅγιος means holy, pure, undefiled; δίκαιος means righteous, living in conformity with the holy Law of God. *Holiness* might be called the well-spring; *righteousness,* the water gushing forth. Holiness, the inner attitude; righteousness, the outward manifestation; holiness, the spirit, the character; righteousness, the work, the deed. Note that Peter does not call Jesus *a* holy and just one; he separates Him from all sinners; he distinguishes Him also from all those who are called holy and just by God Himself. Jesus is in a class by Himself; He is *the* Holy One and Just. That is an attribute of God, Is. 6, 9; 40, 25. Him whom God glorified; Him who had challenged them to prove Him guilty of even one sin, John 8, 46; Him whom even devils acknowledged as the Holy One, Mark 1, 24, — Him they denied. Following the promptings of your own sinful wickedness, you desired that instead of the Holy One of Israel there be given you as a gracious gift (χαρισθῆναι), a man, ἄνδρα, and not a man holy and just, but a murderer, a wicked man, a transgressor of God's will and the law of man. Not satisfied

with that, you *killed the Prince of Life.* That is the last and most grievous charge brought by Peter. The Prince, the Author, of life; cf. Heb. 2, 10; 12, 2. Some interpreters restrict *life* to spiritual life. The contrast with *murderer,* however, seems to indicate that also physical life is included. Christ is the Author of life in every form, physical, mental, spiritual, temporal, eternal. He is the Fountainhead af life, John 5, 26; His words were spirit and life, Matt. 11, 5. 6. Him you killed. Unfathomable mystery, unfathomable wickedness! How is it possible that man had the power to kill the Prince of Life, that man should sink so deeply into wickedness as to slay the Holy One and Just? That is the charge which Peter raised against the Jews of his day in order to bring them to a realization of their guilt. That charge stands to-day against every human being and must be repeated, reiterated, by all faithful preachers without fear or favor until the charge *"You* have killed the Prince of Life" changes in the mouth of every individual into the confession, "I delivered up, I denied, I killed the Prince of Life."

The Prince of Life did not remain dead. That was impossible, chap. 2, 24. You killed and became guilty. God raised Him from the dead and thus became the Justifier of the ungodly through the Author of life. Man did the seemingly impossible, killing the Son of God, thereby sealing, as far as he was concerned, his own doom. God did the seemingly impossible by raising His servant from the dead, that Servant whom He Himself had sent into the world to redeem sinful mankind, Is. 53. By raising Him, the Lord God Almighty Himself put the stamp of approval on the work carried out at His command by His faithful Servant, Rom. 4, 25; 2 Cor. 5, 19 ff. O marvelous wisdom and power of God, who has made the wickedness of man in killing the Prince of Life instrumental in consummating His plan to save man from sin, to forgive man his wickedness, to grant to the slayers of the Prince of Life that life eternal which this Prince through His death, inflicted by mortal man, earned and procured for all mankind! O the depth of the riches of the wisdom, the power, the loving-kindness of God! How unfathomable His wisdom, how unsearchable His power! And His grace and mercy, how utterly past finding out!

"Whereof we are witnesses." The apostles were not eye-witnesses of the resurrection, but they could witness to the fact that Jesus had risen, since He had appeared to them.

And His name, through faith in His name, hath made this man strong whom ye see and know; yea, the faith which is by Him hath given him this perfect soundness in the presence of you all, v. 16. The purpose of the apostles is to turn the attention of the people away from themselves to Jesus. They displayed the same spirit that moved John the Baptist to make his noble confession, John 3, 29 ff.

Note the stress laid on the name of Jesus and on the faith in His name. Twice the apostle mentions the *name* of Jesus. That name Jesus was given to this Person by God Himself, Matt. 1, 21, and is, like the person of Jesus, a precious gift of God, Acts 4, 12. In that name and with that name Jesus offers Himself and all His blessings to mankind. That name conveys to all who believingly accept it full, complete life and salvation. Though Jesus Himself is invisible, His name can be seen and heard and read and spoken, and that name is as ointment poured forth, Song of Sol. 1, 3; as a strong tower into which the righteous runs and is safe, Prov. 18, 10. This name justifies, sanctifies, preserves, saves to the uttermost, John 1, 12; 20, 31; Acts 10, 43; 1 Cor. 6, 11.

The power to heal and to save lies indeed in the name of Jesus; yet this name of Jesus is not a magic formula, cp. Acts 19, 13—17. Very emphatically Peter states that the lame man was healed through, ἐπί, on the ground of, faith which rests on Jesus' name, πίστει τοῦ ὀνόματος, the genitive denoting that faith makes this name its object, its foundation. The Savior promised the power to perform miracles "in My name" only to those that believe, and believe not only in the efficacy of His name to perform cures, but believe in that Gospel to be preached to all nations, Mark 16, 16—18, believe unto everlasting life. Only saving faith is efficacious faith, and only the faith of His name, faith trusting in His name, is saving faith. Any other so-called "faith" is superstition, inefficacious, idolatrous.

Such faith is not of man's making. Says Peter: "the faith which is *by* Him," δι' αὐτοῦ, through Him, wrought by Him. Jesus, the Prince of Life, the Author of our salvation, Heb. 2, 10, is also the Author and Finisher of our faith. Our faith lives, moves, and has its being in and by Him alone. Hence so little are we to be regarded as having wrought that miracle by our own power and holiness that the very faith in His name through which that man was cured is not of our own making, but the work of Jesus and His name, Ps. 115, 1.

Very significantly the apostle describes the cure as a ὁλοκληρία, a complete physical well-being, so that every single member of his body is fit for use. This remarkable miracle was performed on a man whom you see and know, and it was performed not in secret, but *in the presence of you all.* You were not privileged to see the risen Lord, Acts 10, 41, but that does not make His resurrection and power in the least doubtful. Here in the sight of you all He has manifested His living power. We are witnesses of His resurrection, v. 15; you are witnesses of the effects and fruits of His resurrection. Therefore believe on Him and have everlasting life, vv. 17—26.

Wonder and amazement, joy and jubilant praise, fill our hearts as we read this passage and apply its lesson to our lives. *"All Hail the Power of Jesus' Name!"* 1. He is the Ruler of our lives, vv. 1—5;

2. He is the Healer of our woes, vv. 6—8; 3. He is the Savior of our souls, vv. 9—16. — *The Name of Jesus Glorified:* 1. In the lame man, vv. 1—8. So Christ blesses us with many gifts. 2. Through the lame man. His personal testimony, vv. 8—11; He prepared for the apostles an opportunity to proclaim the Gospel. — Luke makes much of faith and clearly states that it is God's work. *Faith Is Clearly God's Work.* 1. Because of its divine object. Jesus, though the Nazarene, is still the Christ, the Holy and Just One, the Prince of Life, delivered up by man, yet performing as God's Servant God's work of redemption; raised up for our justification. 2. Because of its divine effects. It appropriates to us what the Servant has procured. We are sure that we belong to God's people, v. 13 (He, the God of our fathers, is our God); it makes us grateful worshipers, v. 1; willing to aid our neighbor in every need, vv. 6. 7; fearless confessors of His name, vv. 8—16. — *"Such as I Have Give I Thee."* 1. In bodily need. Peter had no silver, but gave what he had; we have not the gift of performing miracles, but give whatever we have — love, pity, help, money, etc. 2. In spiritual need. As Peter gave the Bread of Life to the lame man and to all assembled, so let us spread the Gospel.

Theo. Laetsch.

Dispositionen über die erste von der Synodalkonferenz angenommene Evangelienreihe.

Vierter Sonntag nach Trinitatis.

Matth. 7, 1—6.

In unserer Zeit wird wenig ermahnt. Man redet wohl von Matth. 18, aber an der Ausführung dieser Worte fehlt es. Man will sich die Finger nicht verbrennen. Es sollte viel mehr ermahnt werden, Matth. 18, 15—20. Das Wohl des Mitmenschen sowie auch der Gemeinde erfordert es. Die Ermahnung soll aber einem heilsamen Zwecke dienen. Dieses muß man immer im Auge behalten. In unserm Text haben wir Regeln, nach denen wir uns richten sollen.

Was soll ich bedenken, wenn ich meine Mitmenschen ermahnen muß?

1. Ich darf nicht lieblos richten.
2. Ich muß erst auf meine eigene Sünden achten.
3. Ich muß auch mit der Ermahnung aufzuhören wissen.

1.

„Richtet nicht!" Das soll nicht heißen, daß man den Zorn Gottes über die Sünde nicht verkündigen darf. „Heiden und Zöllner", Matth. 18, 17. „Tut von euch selbst hinaus" usw., 1 Kor. 5, 13; auch V. 5. Das ist nicht der Menschen, sondern Gottes Gericht. Hier ist auch nicht

gemeint, daß der einzelne Christ oder mehrere oder die Gemeinde dem unbußfertigen keinen Vorhalt tun oder ihn schließlich nicht von der Gemeinde ausschließen dürfen. Das hat Gott selbst geboten und geordnet, Matth. 18. Hier handelt es sich um das lieblose Richten, da man ohne jegliche Rücksicht den armen Mitmenschen verurteilt. Oft geschieht dies aus reinem Neid oder aus Rachsucht, oder weil man den Nächsten einfach nicht leiden kann. Daß dies gewöhnlich hinter dem Rücken des Nächsten geschieht, bedarf kaum der Erwähnung. — Aber solch liebloses, unbarmherziges Richten ist auch nicht am Platz, wenn wir ganz direkt mit dem Nächsten handeln. Auch dann sollen wir nicht „richten", ihn nicht lieblos verurteilen, ihm nicht allerlei böse Absichten zuschreiben.

„So werdet ihr auch nicht gerichtet." Wer immer andere verurteilt, wird von andern verurteilt, 1 Mos. 16, 12. Gott wird solche Menschen richten, Jak. 3, 1; Röm. 2, 3; 14, 10. Wer sich des Richtens enthält und in aller Liebe seine Mitmenschen behandelt, handelt als Kind Gottes und wird nicht gerichtet. — „Eben mit dem Maß" usw. Das geschieht oft schon hier auf Erden. Wie wird's aber werden an jenem großen Tage, da ein jeglicher empfangen wird, „nach dem er gehandelt hat" usw., 2 Kor. 5, 10; Röm. 14, 10; Matth. 25, 32; Offenb. 20, 12. 13? Vor Gott kann niemand bestehen, Ps. 130, 3. Darum: Röm. 14, 13.

2.

Wer dem göttlichen Befehl des Ermahnens nachkommen will, muß erst auf sich selbst achten. Wir haben unsere eigenen Fehler, Gebrechen, Sünden, die gar groß und deren sehr viele sind, Luk. 15, 21; Ps. 19, 13. Wie oft geschieht es, daß man auf die Sünden des Nächsten achtet, ja dieselben heftig tadelt und straft und dabei die eigenen Fehler, die vielleicht noch schwerwiegender sind, übersieht! Wenn wir unter das helle Licht des Gesetzes treten, werden wir bald erkennen, daß wir täglich bitten müssen: „Vergib uns unsere Schuld!" Wir werden manche „Balken" sehen, die entfernt werden müssen. Wir haben alle Ursache, in wahrer Buße zum Heiland zu kommen und bei ihm Vergebung zu suchen; und dann sollen wir mit Gottes Hilfe die Sünde ablegen. Erst dann sind wir recht geschickt, uns mit den „Splittern" im Auge des Nächsten abzugeben. Wer in seinen eigenen Sünden weiter leben will und dann versucht, andere zu ermahnen, der heuchelt nur; er bemüht sich mit den Splittern anderer, da er doch Balken noch in seinem eigenen Auge hat. Luther: „Das gilt nicht, daß die großen Diebe die kleinen hängen, und große Schälke die kleinen verdammen."

3.

Es gibt Leute, mit denen sich nichts anfangen läßt. Sie wollen einfach in ihren Sünden weiterleben. Wenn man ihnen Vorhalt tut, lachen sie über die Sünde, verachten alle Mahnung, spotten und lästern und treiben es dann wohl um so toller. Daher vergleicht JEsus sie

mit Hunden und Säuen. Wenn man Säuen Perlen vorlegt, so haben sie keine Ahnung von deren Wert und treten sie einfach in den Schmutz. So wird Gottes Wort von den unbußfertigen, mutwilligen Sündern nur in den Kot getreten. Ja, wie Hunde, wenn man ihnen Perlen statt Futter gibt, sich wenden und ihren Wärter zerreißen, so richten auch die Unbußfertigen nur Schaden in der Gemeinde an, zerreißen sie, reißen andere mit ins Verderben, ruinieren die Gemeinde Gottes. Da heißt es nicht mehr ermahnen, sondern hinaustun, ausschließen, sie ihrem Herrn, dem Teufel, übergeben.

Gott gebe uns rechte Weisheit zu reden, wenn es gilt zu reden, mit aller Geduld den sündigenden Bruder zu ermahnen, dabei aber stets der eigenen Sündhaftigkeit eingedenk zu sein, die offenbaren und unbußfertigen Sünder hingegen von der christlichen Gemeinde auszuschließen!

J. W. Behnken.

Fünfter Sonntag nach Trinitatis.

Joh. 1, 43—51.

Das altkirchliche Evangelium für diesen Sonntag handelt von Petri Fischzug und ist ein rechter Missionstext. Luk. 5, 4 galt nicht bloß dem Simon Petrus und seinen Gesellen bei ihrem leiblichen Fischfang, sondern es gilt allen Jüngern JEsu noch heutigestags bei ihrem geistlichen Fischfang; vgl. V. 10b. Auch der eben verlesene Text ist ein rechter Missionstext. Wir erblicken darin:

JEsum und seinen Jünger im Werk der Mission.

1. Durch ihre Einladung haben sie Menschen selig gemacht.
2. Durch ihr Beispiel reizen sie uns zu gleichem Eifer.

1.

a. V. 43. War das ein Befehl? Der Form nach, ja. Aber in Wahrheit war es eine freundliche Einladung und ein kräftiger Ruf und Zug zum Heiland. Denn Philippus ist der Einladung gerne gefolgt und ist ein treuer Jünger JEsu geworden. Er trat alsbald in JEsu Dienst und trieb dasselbe hohe Werk an Nathanael, das JEsus an ihm getan hatte, V. 45. Aber Philippus tat dies nicht aus eigener Vernunft noch Kraft, sondern der Heilige Geist hat ihn durch das von JEsu geredete Evangelium berufen, mit seinen Gaben erleuchtet, das Licht des Glaubens in ihm angezündet, ihn auch im rechten Glauben geheiligt. Daher sein alsbaldiges Folgen und treues Dienen. Siehe 1 Kor. 12, 3b; Joh. 6, 44a; Phil. 3, 13.

b. Nathanael ist nicht ohne weiteres der Einladung gefolgt. Er hatte Bedenken, V. 46a. Christus sollte doch in Bethlehem geboren werden, Micha 5, 1, nicht in Nazareth, V. 46b. Da war nun dies der beste Rat für Nathanael: Geh selber zu JEsu hin und rede mit ihm und höre ihm zu. Dann wirst du schon erkennen, ob er der verheißene Chri-

stus ist oder nicht. Nathanael folgte diesem Rat und ging zu JEsu hin. Und nun nahm JEsus ihn in seine Kur, V. 47. Welch ein Wort! Konnte JEsus Nathanael ins Herz sehen? War er wirklich der Herzenskündiger? V. 48. „Dort unter dem Feigenbaum, in aller Abgeschiedenheit, hat Nathanael seine Art, seines Herzens Gesinnung, hervorgekehrt, hat da zu Gott geseufzt und gebetet und sonderlich um das Kommen des Messias gebetet. Darauf stand Sinnen und Sehnen aller rechtschaffenen Israeliten. Dies Gebet war jetzt erhört." (Stöckhardt.)

Ja, auch Nathanael war für JEsum gewonnen worden. Der Heiland hatte ihn und er hatte den Heiland gefunden. — JEsus gab ihm noch eine schöne Verheißung, V. 50. 51. „Es begann jetzt die Zeit der öffentlichen Wundertätigkeit JEsu, und mit seinen vielen und großen Zeichen hat JEsus bewiesen, in wie enger Gemeinschaft, in wie regem Verkehr er mit Gott, seinem Vater, stand." Ja, durch JEsum, des Menschen Sohn, das heißt, den menschgewordenen Gottessohn, ist uns sündigen Menschen der Himmel geöffnet worden. JEsus ist die rechte Himmelsleiter, auf der wir zu Gott steigen und Gott sich zu uns herabläßt. Durch ihn kommen wir schließlich auch nach Leib und Seele in den Himmel. Und nicht bloß wir, sondern, walt's Gott, noch viele andere durch unsern Dienst. Davon zweitens.

2.

a. JEsus „findet" Philippus, Philippus „findet" Nathanael. Finden setzt suchen voraus. Wir sollen Sünder suchen und für den Himmel zu gewinnen uns bemühen. Welche? Alle, die noch nicht „gefunden" sind, Mark. 16, 15. Ja, alle, Reiche und Arme, Hohe und Niedrige, Junge und Alte, Männer und Weiber, Ehrbare und Verrufene: Zachäus und Lazarus, Joseph von Arimathia und den Schächer am Kreuz, Nikodemus und Maria Magdalena und das Weib am Jakobsbrunnen. Der Heiland ist für sie alle gestorben und will sie alle in seinem Himmel haben, 1 Tim. 2, 4; 2 Petr. 3, 9.

b. Wir sollen gerade auch den einzelnen Seelen nachgehen, sie aufsuchen in ihren Häusern usw., mit ihnen reden. JEsus sprach zu Philippus: „Folge mir nach!" Ohne Zweifel hatte Philippus JEsu zugehört. „Wir haben" usw., V. 45b, sprach Philippus zu Nathanael. So sollen auch wir nicht bloß die Leute einladen, in die Kirche zu kommen und da Gottes Wort zu hören, sondern sollen auch selber ihnen das Wort vom Sünderheiland sagen. Denn von dem haben Moses und die Propheten geschrieben, 1 Mos. 3, 15; 2 Mos. 34, 6. 7a; Jes. 53. Vgl. Apost. 10, 43.

Sprichst du: „Das können wir Laienchristen nicht so tun; wir haben die Schrift nicht so gelernt", so antworte ich dir: Eine lange Predigt braucht nicht gehalten zu werden. Von Philippus ist uns nicht eine einzige längere Predigt aufbewahrt. Aber Philippus wird in der Schrift oft erwähnt, und fast immer finden wir ihn damit beschäftigt, Leute zu Christo zu weisen oder zu führen. Das ist richtige Missions-

arbeit, und das können alle Christen; denn sie sind ja „alle von Gott gelehrt". Lange Disputationen sind auch selten am Platz. Eine kurze Aufforderung: „Komm und siehe es!" ist oft vollständig genügend und wirksam.

c. Eins können wir freilich nicht tun, nämlich den Leuten ins Herz sehen. Aber das konnte Philippus ebenfalls nicht. Das erwartet der Heiland darum auch nicht von uns. Das besorgt er, V. 47. 48. Wir können auch nicht Sünder bekehren. Das kann allein er, der Philippus und Nathanael bekehrt hat. Aber wir können und sollen Sündern das Wort sagen. Wir können und sollen sie auf ihre Sünde und auf ihren Heiland aufmerksam machen und sie einladen, zu ihm zu kommen. Wir können und sollen auch für sie beten, Jak. 5, 16b; Apost. 4, 24—33. Und geben können wir für die Mission und Missionare aussenden, die in unserm Namen das Wort vom Heilande verkündigen, Apost. 13, 1—3.

Gott gebe uns rechten Missionssinn und Missionseifer! Das übrige wird sich dann schon finden. J. A. Rimbach.

Sechster Sonntag nach Trinitatis.

Matth. 18, 1—14.

In diesem langen Text werden uns verschiedene wichtige Lehren vorgeführt: der rechte Jüngersinn im Dienste des Heilandes (nicht Hoffart, sondern Demut), das Ärgernisgeben mit seinen schrecklichen Folgen, der Engeldienst an Kindern, die Heilandsliebe zu armen Sündern. Aber als Thema für den ganzen Text passen sehr wohl die Worte V. 10:

„Sehet zu, daß ihr nicht jemand von diesen Kleinen verachtet!"

Denn der Heiland selbst

1. stellt uns die kleinen Kinder zum Vorbild dar;
2. übergibt sie unserer besonderen Fürsorge.

1.

a. Hinsichtlich ihrer Demut. Die Jünger stritten sich untereinander, wer wohl der Größte im Himmelreich sei, V. 1; Kap. 20, 20—28. Hochmut und Hoffart hatte der Jünger Herz eingenommen. Hochmut hatte einst Eva zu Fall gebracht, 1 Mos. 3, 5. 6. Die Jünger wollten zu hohen Ehren und Ansehen kommen, aber auf verkehrte Weise. Da mußte ein kleines Kind ihnen als Vorbild dienen, V. 2—4. Der Vergleichspunkt ist die kindliche Demut. Als kleine Kinder spielen Königssohn und Bettlerssohn miteinander und denken nicht daran, daß etwa der eine höheren Ranges ist als der andere; sie sind sich einfach zwei kleine menschliche Geschöpfe. Solche Demut ist eben ein Charakteristikum eines kleinen Kindes. Das Kind ist sich dessen allerdings nicht

bewußt; aber bei erwachsenen Christen soll nun solche Demut mit Bewußtsein geübt werden. Nur der, bei dem sich diese Demut findet, hat den rechten Kindessinn, Joh. 13, 14. 15; Phil. 2, 6—8, und wird von Gott in seinem Reich erhöht werden, V. 4; Luk. 18, 14; Matth. 20, 25—28.

Der natürliche Hochmut und Ehrgeiz steckt uns allen noch im Herzen. Man läßt sich gern bedienen, aber andern dienen will man nicht. Wie ganz anders stünde es in unsern Familien und Gemeinden, wenn der Kindessinn der demütig dienstbaren Liebe uns mehr beseelte! Dieser ist aber eine Frucht des Glaubens; und daß wir den Glauben haben, muß unsere erste Sorge sein. — Und die Kinder sind uns auch ein Vorbild

b. hinsichtlich ihres Glaubens, V. 6. Von kleinen Kindern redet der Heiland in unserm Text. Man sehe sich die griechischen Wörter an, V. 2. 3. 5, besonders auch V. 4. 10. 14. Und von diesen kleinen Kindern sagt der Heiland, daß sie glauben. Und diesen einfältigen Kindesglauben muß ein jeder haben, der ins Reich Gottes hineinkommen und darin bleiben will, Mark. 10, 15. Wem ein Kind Zutrauen schenkt, dem glaubt es aufs Wort hin; es operiert da nicht erst lange mit allerlei Vernunftschlüssen. Die kindliche Einfalt beim Glauben soll uns zum Muster dienen. — Nach langer Trockenheit erflehte einst ein Vater in seinem Familienkreis von Gott im Gebet einen gnädigen Regen. Als der Vater dann mit seinem Söhnchen zur Kirche ging, bemerkte der Vater unterwegs, daß der Kleine einen Regenschirm bei sich hatte, obwohl am Himmel nicht eine einzige Wolke stand. „Wozu das, Kind?“ „Vater, du hast ja Gott um Regen gebeten.“ Das war kindlicher Glaube. Und als der Gottesdienst aus war, regnete es wirklich. Gott schenke uns einen solch kindlichen Glauben!

Kann man nun aber von Kindern so viel lernen, dann soll man sie wahrlich nicht verachten. Kinder haben mit ihrer Demut und ihrem Glauben nicht nur die Apostel selbst beschämt, sondern auch seitdem manchen Christen.

Weiter sollen wir Kinder nicht verachten, weil der Heiland gerade sie unserer besonderen Fürsorge anbefohlen hat.

2.

a. Der Heiland selbst nimmt sich besonders der Kinder an. Er ist auch ihr Heiland und will nicht, daß auch nur ein Kind verloren werde, V. 10—14; er hat ihnen auch ganz besonderen Engelschutz zugesagt, V. 10. Daraus ersehen wir schon, daß die Kleinen bei uns in hoher Achtung stehen sollen. Das schärft der Heiland aber noch recht ein

b. durch ganz besondere Anweisungen, die er uns gibt.

aa. Wir sollen die Kinder in seinem Namen aufnehmen, V. 5. Solchen Liebesdienst will er ansehen als ihm selbst erwiesen, V. 5.

bb. Wir sollen uns ja hüten, einem Kinde Ärgernis zu geben, wodurch es in seinem Christentum gehindert wird oder gar seinen Glauben verliert, V. 6—9. Welcher schweren Sünde man sich durch Ärgernisgeben schuldig macht, geht aus V. 6 hervor. Wie unvorsichtig sind oft Eltern und andere Christen, anstatt ihnen allezeit mit gutem Beispiel voranzugehen!

Hieran schließe man nun die Ermahnung betreffs des rechten Verhältnisses Kindern gegenüber in der Familie und in der Gemeinde und hebe recht hervor die Pflicht und den Nutzen der christlichen Kindererziehung, Eph. 6, 1—4 (Taufe, Hausgottesdienst, Gemeindeschule, Sonntagsschule).

Und obwohl man der Rute nicht schonen soll, Spr. 13, 24; 22, 15; 23, 13. 14, so sollen doch Eltern und Lehrer keine Stockmeister sein, sondern christliche Erzieher, die die Liebe walten lassen, 1 Thess. 2, 7. 8.

Schluß: V. 10a. Herzliche Mahnung. J. H. C. Fritz.

Siebter Sonntag nach Trinitatis.

Matth. 18, 15—20.

Wiewohl ein Christ gerechtfertigt ist durch den Glauben und Vergebung aller seiner Sünden hat, so ist er doch noch Fleisch und Blut und sündigt täglich. Darum ist es auch nötig, daß er wieder und immer wieder ermahnt und an seine Pflicht gegen Gott und seinen Nächsten erinnert wird. Er wird ermahnt, wenn er Gottes Wort hört und liest, wenn sein Seelsorger mit ihm öffentlich oder sonderlich handelt. Er soll aber auch von seinen Mitchristen ermahnt werden, wo das nötig ist. Diese sollen ihn nicht auf Abwege gehen lassen, ohne daß sie ihn auf des HErrn Willen aufmerksam machen und ihn zur Rückkehr mahnen. Das ist Christenpflicht. Davon handelt unser Text.

Von der brüderlichen Ermahnung.

1. Wer ist zu ermahnen?
2. Wer soll den Bruder ermahnen?
3. In welcher Gesinnung soll man den Bruder ermahnen?

1.

Der sündigende Bruder ist zu ermahnen. Hier ist nicht die Rede von solchen, die keine Verbindung mit der Kirche haben. Die leben ja gänzlich in Sünden. Ihnen gegenüber haben wir eine ganz bestimmte Pflicht. Hier aber redet der HErr von unsern Glaubensbrüdern und -schwestern.

Solche Brüder sind zu ermahnen, wenn sie sündigen, V. 15. Es muß nun aber auch eine wirkliche Sünde sein, nicht nur ein Verdacht,

den wir hegen, nicht eine eingebildete Sünde. Welche Sünden sind wohl gemeint? Gewiß nicht alle Sünden, zum Beispiel nicht die Schwachheitssünden, um derentwillen der Bruder täglich um Vergebung bittet und die uns selbst noch stets anhaften. Solche Sünden sind vielmehr gemeint, die wider die Seele streiten, bei denen der Glaube nicht bestehen kann, die den Bruder schließlich ins Verderben stürzen können. Wenn wir ihn dann zurückbringen, so haben wir ihn gewonnen. Solche Sünden werden 1 Kor. 5, 11 genannt. Andere Sünden dieser Art sind Verachtung der Gnadenmittel, Haß und Feindschaft, weltliches Leben und Wesen. Ja, selbst Schwachheitssünden, wenn sie zur Gewohnheit werden, können und werden schließlich den Glauben rauben.

Ermahnt soll der Bruder werden, der an dir sündigt, der dir selbst Schaden zufügt, dich beleidigt und dir Unrecht tut. Oder aber, wer sich gegen Gott und sein Wort versündigt und du weißt von dieser Sünde, der muß von dir gestraft werden. Und damit ist die Frage beantwortet: Wer soll den Bruder ermahnen?

2.

Zuerst und vor allen Dingen heißt es: „Sündigt dein Bruder an dir, so gehe hin und strafe ihn." Du, an dem er sich versündigt, der das Unrecht leidet oder sieht. Es ist deine heilige Pflicht, V. 15. Und zwar strafe ihn allein. Sage es nicht deinem Pastor oder einem andern. Bist du vielleicht der einzige Zeuge oder einer der wenigen Zeugen, dann handle mit ihm allein.

Der liebe Gott läßt da keine Ausreden gelten. Gar mancher sagt: „Das ist nicht meine Sache. Andere wissen auch davon, daß der Bruder sich dem Trunke ergibt. Warum reden die nicht mit ihm? Ich möchte es vielleicht mit ihm verderben. Das geht mich nichts an." Aber, lieber Freund, was sagt der HErr? „Gehe hin und strafe ihn!" Da kommt vielleicht der Einwurf: „Es bezahlt sich nicht. Er wird doch nicht auf mich hören. Andere haben vielleicht schon mit ihm geredet. Er weiß es besser. Kann mir die Mühe sparen." Aber ob unser Versuch erfolgreich ist oder nicht, einerlei wie hoffnungslos der Fall dir scheint, geh doch auf Gottes Befehl zu ihm hin.

Was sollen wir nun tun? Statt andern von der Sünde des Bruders zu sagen, sollen wir nach Spr. 11, 13 handeln. Aber getreuen Herzens vergessen wir die Sache nicht, sondern ermahnen nun den Bruder, halten ihm seine Sünde vor, warnen ihn vor deren Folgen und bitten ihn, um Christi willen doch zur Einsicht zu kommen, Buße zu tun und einen frommen Wandel zu führen. Wie schön, wenn der Bruder auf uns hört! Dann haben wir ihn gewonnen, ihn dem Teufel und der Verdammnis vielleicht entrissen. Wir mögen es wohl wieder versuchen, wenn er das erste Mal nicht gehört hat. Bleibt er unbußfertig, dann: V. 16. Die sollen Zeugen sein, sollen uns auch unterstützen in unserer Rede, wenn wir ihm die große Gefahr vorhalten, in der er schwebt. Die

Zeugen müssen natürlich einen unbescholtenen Ruf haben. Hört er auf sie, so ist alles vergeben und vergessen, und der Bruder ist gewonnen. Andernfalls aber: V. 17. „Sage es der Gemeinde", das heißt, der Ortsgemeinde. Vgl. V. 20. Die andern, die wir mitgenommen haben, sollen nun bezeugen, daß der Bruder recht ermahnt worden ist und daß er immer noch unbußfertig ist. Nun sollen alle Glieder, nicht nur der Pastor, ihr Bestes tun, um den Bruder zu bewegen, von seinem bösen Wege umzukehren. Hört er sie, dann ist die Sache erledigt. Hört er aber nicht, dann kann er nicht mehr als Bruder angesehen, sondern muß aus der christlichen Gemeinde als ein Heide und Zöllner ausgeschlossen werden. Und zwar ist diese Handlung der Gemeinde „also kräftig und gewiß, als handelte es unser lieber HErr Christus mit ihm selber". S. V. 18.

Aber in welchem Sinn und Geist soll diese brüderliche Bestrafung vorgenommen werden?

3.

Die Antwort ergibt sich aus dem Zweck dieser Ermahnung. Man will den Bruder nicht demütigen, man will nicht Unwillen in ihm erwecken gegen die ermahnenden Brüder; auch will die Gemeinde nicht gerne einen Bruder loswerden, der etwa schwach ist. Nein, der Zweck ist nach dem Text, den Bruder zu gewinnen, ihn zurückzugewinnen für den Heiland und seine Kirche, V. 15. Das zeigt der Kontext, V. 11. Gleichnis vom verlornen Schaf, V. 12. 13. Siehe auch V. 14. So muß in diesem ganzen Handel, in Ermahnung, in Ausübung von Kirchenzucht, der e i n e Zweck sein, den Bruder zu retten.

Daraus folgt, w i e wir den Bruder ermahnen sollen. Nicht mit hochmütigem Geist, als wären wir besser als er, sondern als arme Sünder, die einen Mitsünder, einen Miterlösten, selig machen möchten. „Helfet ihm wieder zurecht mit sanftmütigem Geist!"

O wieviel besser stände es um die Kirche Gottes, wenn die Mahnung unsers Textes recht befolgt würde! Viele fallen ab. Wer weiß von ihrer Sünde und Gefahr? Nicht der Pastor zuerst, sondern Freunde, Verwandte, Bekannte. Die sehen, wie er anfängt zu trinken, spielen, spotten, die Gnadenmittel zu verachten. Warum sollen wir uns nicht um sein Seelenheil bekümmern? ihn ermahnen? Er mag noch umkehren, ehe es zu spät ist. Zu viele sagen mit Kain: „Soll ich meines Bruders Hüter sein?" Ein solcher Hüter bist auch du nach unserm Text. Hast du es in der Vergangenheit versäumt? Tu Buße! Nimm dir vor, es soll besser werden. Wenn doch alle, Kinder, junge Leute, Erwachsene, ihre volle Pflicht täten, wieviel Unheil könnte vermieden, wie viele könnten vor großem Seelenschaden bewahrt werden! Wer Gift nehmen will, wer in den Pfad eines Autos gehen will, den warnen wir. Sollten wir es nicht im Geistlichen ebenso machen? Der größte Dienst, den wir einem Bruder erweisen können. Gott selbst hat Wohlgefallen daran, Jak. 5, 19. 20.

P a u l K ö n i g.

Miscellanea.

Die liturgische Bewegung nach deutschländischer Beurteilung.

Die liturgische Bewegung der letzten Jahre, die ja auch hier in Amerika weite Kreise in Mitleidenschaft gezogen hat, stammt bekanntlich ursprünglich aus Deutschland, wo sie besonders unter dem Einfluß Heilers in der hochkirchlichen Bewegung emporblühte. So wertvoll nach manchen Seiten hin die Anregung war, die man durch ein Besinnen auf das liturgische Erbteil der Reformation geben wollte, so verhängnisvoll war es andererseits, daß Heiler und seine Genossen nur zu bald eine entschiedene Neigung romwärts kundgaben. Diese Tatsache wurde auch bald erkannt, namentlich von gewissen Vertretern der Richtung, die in der „Monatsschrift für Gottesdienst und kirchliche Kunst" mit deren Beiheften „Das Heilige und die Form" zum Ausdruck kommt.

Besonders wertvoll für das Studium der ganzen Bewegung sind aber auch eine ganze Anzahl von Monographien, die in den letzten Jahren erschienen sind. Vor uns liegen zwei dieser Hefte, nämlich „Gottesdienst und Rechtfertigungsglaube, Luthers Grundlegung evangelischer Liturgik bis zum Jahre 1523", von Adolf Allwohn, und „Die liturgische Bewegung der Gegenwart im Lichte der Theologie Luthers", von Otto Dietz.

Die erstgenannte Schrift geht auf die einzelnen Momente ein, die in Luthers liturgischen Schriften in den ersten Jahren seiner theologischen Entwicklung hervortreten, namentlich seine allmähliche Erkenntnis der den römischen Kultformen anhängenden übel. Schon vor dem Jahre 1515 merkte Luther deutlich die Gefährlichkeit der leeren Zeremonien, und damals schon wagte er es, zu sagen, daß die Wurzel alles übels darin besteht, daß das Evangelium nicht in rechter Weise gepredigt wird. Diese Erkenntnis tritt noch deutlicher hervor in seiner Römerbriefvorlesung, wo er ausdrücklich sagt, daß die vielen Kirchengebräuche vor dem Evangelium nicht bestehen können. Ein weiterer Grundsatz, der sich bei Luther um diese Zeit Bahn brach, ist dieser, daß es nicht gleichgültig ist, welche Zeremonien befolgt werden, sondern ihre Art hat dem Grundgesetz der Gottes- und Nächstenliebe zu entsprechen. Zur Beseitigung eines falschen Vertrauens auf äußerliche Handlungen empfahl Luther schon damals deren Verminderung und die Einführung einer rechten Belehrung über den Glauben. Allwohn schreibt: „Aus denselben Gründen hält er auch eine Revision der gesamten kirchlichen Satzungen, eine Beseitigung des rein äußerlichen Prunkes und eine Verminderung der Gebetszeremonien und der kultischen Gewänder für angezeigt." In den Worten Luthers: „Quia haec crescunt in dies et ita crescunt, ut sub illis decrescat fides et charitas et nutriatur avaritia, superbia, vana gloria, immo quod peius est, quod illi homines sperant salvari, nihil solliciti de interno homine." In den nächsten Jahren war Luther vor allem darauf bedacht, das Volk zu belehren, daß ein liturgischer Akt noch lange kein gottesdienstlicher ist. Überhaupt legte der Reformator ein sehr großes Gewicht auf die sakramentale Seite des Gottesdienstes, um das Tun Gottes den Zuhörern recht vorzubilden und das Wesen des Gottesdienstes als ein Schenken und Wirken Gottes zu betonen.

In der Schrift von Dietz, die durch eine Thesenreihe eingeleitet wird,

ist sonderlich Thesis 5 von großer Wichtigkeit: „Der Gottesdienstgedanke Luthers ist der konsequente Ausdruck seiner Rechtfertigungslehre. Von ihr aus hat die Predigt zentrale Bedeutung im Gottesdienst und kann und darf niemals durch Liturgie verdrängt oder ersetzt werden.“ Nachdem der Verfasser mancherlei Verirrungen in der liturgischen Bewegung nachgewiesen hat, nicht nur in allgemeinen Reformbestrebungen, sondern auch sonderlich in Ideen der „hochkirchlichen Vereinigung“. (Durchführung der bischöflichen Verfassung, maßvolles Zurücktreten der Predigt), bringt er Luthers liturgische Grundsätze zur Geltung. Um uns kurz zu fassen, zitieren wir einige der schwerwiegendsten Aussagen:

„Die liturgische Bewegung hat in allen ihren geschilderten Typen die Beziehung zum grundlegenden evangelischen Prinzip verloren. Das, was die Reformation als das Wesen des evangelischen Gottesdienstes erarbeitet hat, ist nicht mehr normierend. ... über ihrer Syntheseentheologie [wonach jede neue Zeitperiode ihre eigene gottesdienstliche Zusammenstellung zu machen hat] ist die liturgische Bewegung — so wie sie geschildert wurde — als Ganzes und in ihren Teilen an den Punkt gekommen, wo sie von der Kirche Luthers fast nicht mehr ernst genommen werden kann. Denn die Kirche Luthers weiß, daß das Zentrum alles evangelischen Lebens, auch des evangelischen Gottesdienstes, der Artikel von der Rechtfertigung ist. ... Aus diesem Grunde ‚soll die christliche Gemeinde nimmer zusammenkommen, es werde denn daselbst Gottes Wort gepredigt, es sei auch aufs kürzeste‘. Es ist und bleibt ‚alles Gottesdienstes das größte und fürnehmste Stück, Gottes Wort predigen und hören‘. ... So haben wir der heutigen liturgischen Bewegung gegenüber als Fundamentalsatz auszusprechen, daß die Predigt auf jeden Fall der Mittelpunkt des evangelischen Gottesdienstes bleiben muß. ... Die Kirche Luthers hat also prinzipiell allen liturgischen Bemühungen gegenüber die Warnung vor einer Absolution der Liturgie auszusprechen. Liturgie kann und darf niemals die Predigt verdrängen oder ersetzen wollen. ... Wer also um die Rechtfertigung des Sünders aus Gottes Gnade weiß, der kann nicht vergessen, daß der Mensch allezeit, auch in seinem Gottesdienst, immer nur der Bittende, der ganz und gar Empfangende bleibt. Von da aus wird es unmöglich, im Gottesdienst selbst Gebender und Spendender sein zu wollen; es verbietet sich von diesem Zentrum lutherischen Glaubens aus, im Gottesdienst irgendwie ein ‚religiöses Erlebnis‘ vom Menschen her erzeugen zu wollen. Damit ist über alle die Versuche, die uns bei der Darstellung der heutigen liturgischen Bewegung als mehr oder minder psychologische, pädagogische, vielleicht sogar psychagogische Veranstaltungen entgegengetreten sind, das Wort gesprochen. ... Es ist nach Luther völlig klar: Wer im Gottesdienst versucht, mit psychologischen Mitteln und methodischer Technik im Menschen religiöse Lebensbewegungen hervorzurufen, mißbraucht den evangelischen Gottesdienst; denn durch diese Möglichkeiten wird nur der ψυχικὸς ἄνθρωπος genährt. ... Darum hat auch Luther mit allen unnötigen Zeremonien des römischen Meßgottesdienstes (Räuchern usw.) aufgeräumt. Warum glaubt man, sie heute wieder in seiner Kirche einführen zu müssen? ... Eine Kirche hat über ihr Bekenntnis zu wachen und, also wachend, ihr Bekenntnis immer wieder neu zu entdecken. Wo sie das nicht tut, hat sie aufgehört, Kirche zu sein.“ P. E. K.

Der Name „evangelisch-lutherisch".

In der Artikelreihe „Das lutherische Bekenntnis in den Bekenntnisschriften" schreibt Prof. Ulmer in der „A. E. L. K." vom 10. April: „Jedenfalls bedeutet heute noch das Augsburgische Bekenntnis — also nicht etwa die Konkordie — in vielen Kirchen außerhalb des Deutschen Reiches das Moment, das ihnen geradezu in ‚Evangelische Kirche A. C.' ihren Namen gibt. Hießen die ‚Neuen' ursprünglich Lutheraner, Martianer, lutherisch, so war es Luther selbst, der die Sache des Evangeliums und seinen Namen unverworren haben wollte. So kam im Kreise um ihn die Bezeichnung ‚Evangelische' oder auch ‚Reformierte' auf. Durch die religionsgesellschaftlichem Denken und Wollen entsprungene Union wurde die Bezeichnung ‚evangelisch', die u. a. schon der Große Kurfürst als ein Lutheraner und Reformierte umfassendes Unionswort anstrebte, nunmehr von dieser neuen, erst 1817 gebildeten Union in Anspruch genommen. Und die Lutheraner ließen sich diesen Raub gefallen, statt daß sie der Neubildung zugemutet hätten, sich einen neuen Namen zu wählen. So mußten sie sich fortan Evangelisch-lutherische nennen, eine Bezeichnung, die ja wohl früher schon dann und wann gebraucht worden war, die aber nirgends so ganz als eine kirchliche empfunden wird oder im Unterschied von den ‚Evangelischen' Helvetischer Konfession Evangelische Augsburgischer Konfession. Aber das schien ja wohl den Vätern der Union gut so. Hingegen war es den Reformierten möglich — doch unter Beibehaltung der Bezeichnung ‚reformiert' —, sich fortan mit gleichem Recht auch als ‚Evangelische' zu bezeichnen. Noch im Konkordienbuch gilt der Name ‚Reformierte' übrigens für die Lutheraner. Erst seit dem 17. Jahrhundert wurde die Bezeichnung ‚Reformierte' Konfessionsbezeichnung der Zwinglianer und Calvinisten und erscheint so im Westfälischen Frieden. Die Bezeichnung (nach Gottes Wort) ‚reformiert' wurde dann damals von den Reformierten vor allem im Gegensatz zu den noch im Alten halb steckengebliebenen — wie sie sagten — Evangelischen (Lutheranern) gebraucht." E.

The Need of Doctrinal Preaching.

"This is an age of quacks in religion as well as in medicine. Every nostrum imaginable is offered to cure the Church of its real and supposed ills. They tell us that we must have finer machinery, beautiful buildings, more music, up-to-date programs. There is truth here. These, however, will not make an impotent church mighty in the presence of aggressive evils. Efficiency is their magic word, and the Church has efficiency experts galore. It has built up the most efficient machinery ever made for its missionary enterprise; yet it is recalling its ambassadors, reducing its forces, retreating along all frontiers of activity. Efficiency is not synonymous with life. It is not efficiency, it is effectiveness that is needed.

"The doctors say the Church wants bigger budgets and better programs; but Christ needs bigger and better men. The Church does not need more push, it needs more power; not more doctoring, but more doctrine. . . .

"Doctrinal preaching is difficult. It takes preparation and perspiration to present these cardinal truths in a new, forceful, and persuasive manner. The demands of the present-day pastorate are so great that pas-

tors often cannot take the time to prepare stirring doctrinal messages. Nevertheless it is worth while to pay the price. Great preaching comes from great conviction. Great conviction grows out of great truths. Conviction generates spiritual power.

"The need for doctrinal preaching, Scriptural preaching, is tragic. During our vacations we have heard many sermons with never a Scripture reference. Many preachers did not even take a text. Hungry souls were given sermons made up of funny stories, political discussions, and book reviews. We have been tempted to give what people want. The world wants to be entertained, pleased, applauded, flattered. Like children they want what is not always good for them."

Watchman-Examiner, April 16, 1936.

Blowing Out Lights.

A well-known preacher, who is known to be vitriolic and hypercritical, was shaking hands with members of his congregation after the service. A woman who had been a parishoner of the church in years gone by and who was now engaged in full-time Christian work was in the company that was greeted by the pastor.

"Well, Laura, are you still letting your light shine?" asked the preacher.

"Yes, Doctor," she replied, "just like you are, and I am blowing out everybody else's light, just like you are."

There is no record of the results of this rebuke. One of the greatest tragedies in Christian work to-day is the jealousy that prevails among Christian workers and the destructive, sinful criticism of fellow-workers. Satan must gloat over this phenomenon and the havoc it has wrought. We must be uncompromising in our loyalty to Christ and the Word and in our hatred of sin, but this obligation does not mean that we should be harsh and bitter and hypercritical toward our fellows. Let us remember the wise advice "We should not add to the offense of the Cross our own offensiveness."

Why should a Christian worker magnify and broadcast the faults and failures of a fellow-worker? Some believers seem to specialize in criticism, and they become past masters in their specialty. The critic sometimes goes so far as to peddle lies. Lying is an appalling thing in the sight of God. "All liars shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone," Rev. 21, 8. Sometimes a criticism is an interpretation of an act or an attitude that is a false interpretation because the critic did not have accurate or adequate information. Great harm may result from such criticism. Some one has said that all comments should go through three sieves: First, Is it true? Second, Is it kind? And third, Is it necessary?

Criticism sometimes is necessary; but it should be given to the person involved, and it should be brought in the right spirit. God says: "Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual, restore such a one in the spirit of meekness, considering thyself lest thou also be tempted," Gal. 6, 1. The work of restoration is the work of the spiritual Christian. Too many unspiritual people are undertaking this

work, and it is not being done in the spirit of meekness, but in the spirit of pride.

Christian workers are not faultless, and many have their idiosyncrasies; but if they are faithful in life and testimony to the Lord and His Word, let us refrain from minimizing their influence by criticism. Let us rather rejoice in their successes, speak well of them, and pray for them.

How would it be to declare a moratorium on negative, destructive criticism of fellow-Christians and to go out of the business of "blowing out lights"? Let us echo the wish of the one who said: "Die when I may, I want it said of me by those who knew me best that I always plucked a briar and planted a flower where I thought a flower would grow."

(From *The King's Business*, April, 1936.)

P. E. K.

Anniversary of the Death of Erasmus.

It is four hundred years ago that Erasmus, the famous humanist, left this world. Born October 27, 1464, in Rotterdam, he died in Basel, July 12, 1536. Thinking of him in his relations to Luther and the Reformation, we must say that here we are furnished a striking illustration of the truth that the kingdom of God is built not by human wisdom and power, but by the Holy Spirit operating in the Word. The greatest classical scholar of his age, a writer of rarest grace, a satirist who possessed wit and wisdom in happy combination, a critic who was keenly alive to the many abuses that were afflicting the Church, a man admired and looked up to in all Europe, he nevertheless did not bring about the Reformation of the Church because the great central truth of the Scriptures, that of justification by grace through faith, did not become the all-governing principle of faith and life with him and because he kept on sweeping away the filth that accumulated on the outside of the church instead of plying the broom where cleansing was most needed, in the chief room of the building. Erasmus seems to have been one of those tragic figures that are drawn hither and thither by conflicting motives, without reaching that inner peace and harmony for which the human heart yearns. Luther essentially was right, that appears to have been his conviction; but he deplored Luther's vehemence and uncompromising course, and he felt that, after all, not everything in the Church was wrong. And so he drifted, now maintaining this, now that position, unwilling to become an adherent of Luther and yet unable to remain an ardent son of the Roman Church. How little he understood Luther became evident especially when in 1524 he published his diatribe *The Freedom of the Will*, in which he assailed Luther's position, only to be answered in the latter's annihilating work *On the Servitude of the Will*. We Lutherans may well remind ourselves of the great services which Erasmus, enemy of Luther though he was after the Reformer in his *De Servo Arbitrio* had completely unhorsed him, indirectly rendered the cause of the Reformation. He in 1516 printed the text of the Greek New Testament; together with the Greek text he issued a Latin translation of his own, which in a number of instances was more faithful to the original than the Vulgate; he added notes in this edition which often criticized current views and existing

conditions; he published paraphrases on the books of the New Testament, making them better understood; he edited and printed the writings of Church Fathers, and some of their Greek works he translated into Latin and thus made accurate historical research easier; in numerous philological writings he furnished theologians some of the equipment they needed to penetrate to the heart of Scripture-passages and to defend the true meaning against adversaries; in many works (especially in his *Colloquia* and his famous *Laus Stultitiae*) he castigated the sins and the ignorance of the priests and monks and even of their superiors and helped to destroy the halo with which superstition had invested them. In looking over this list, one can understand the taunt of the enemies of Erasmus in his own camp, "Erasmus laid the egg which Luther hatched." A.

What Others Think of Kagawa.

The following paragraphs appeared in the *Evangelical Student*, as reported in the *Episcopal Recorder* of January, 1936.

"A Christian student and member of the League of Evangelical Students has written a sharp letter challenging a cursory remark made in a previous editorial which classed Toyohiko Kagawa as a Modernist. 'I challenge you to prove one statement or else retract it. Prove that Toyohiko Kagawa is a Modernist or the H—— Chapter of the League will be smaller by at least two members.' This defense of Kagawa was made in the interest of the Student Volunteer Movement, which engaged Kagawa as one of its main speakers at its recent quadrennial convention in Indianapolis.1) The reaction of this student indicates the wide-spread delusion that prevails in America concerning Kagawa and, incidentally, concerning the Student Volunteer Movement. When we consider the large number of speaking engagements before American student bodies that have been arranged for Dr. Kagawa, it becomes important for students to be informed whether Kagawa is an evangelical or a Modernist.

"The philosophy of Toyohiko Kagawa has been set forth in two of his popular books: *The Religion of Jesus* and *Love the Law of Life*. The whole approach of these books is a thoroughly naturalistic one. Jesus is treated as a mere human creature. Man is not felt to be in need of a supernatural salvation either objectively in the death of Christ or subjectively in the regeneration of his sinful heart. The teaching of Kagawa on certain cardinal points of the Christian faith bears this out clearly. What is Kagawa's conception of the person of Christ? 'Jesus experienced God as the forgiver of sins.2) Speaking of redemption, Kagawa says: 'Jesus Christ actually experienced it.3) This makes Christ a sinner. Historic Christianity says Christ 'knew no sin.' What is Kagawa's view of the atonement? 'Some people think that the death of Jesus was a bribe . . . for reconciliation with God. But I take the meaning of Jesus' death humanistically and personally. The true, deep meaning of redemption is that Jesus apologized to God for all the failures and sins of mankind, taking responsibility for them upon Himself.' 4) Christ said He was to

1) The student has since become convinced of his error.
2) Toyohiko Kagawa, *The Religion of Jesus*, p. 35.
3) *Ibid*, p. 56. 4) *Ibid*, p. 57.

die ' for the remission (pardon) of sins.' Paul taught: 'We were reconciled to God by the death of His Son.' Kagawa discredits the bodily resurrection of Jesus. 'We do not know in what form the resurrection did come. Whether it was in the flesh, as the gospels teach, or in the spiritual body, as Paul tells us, it makes no difference.' 5) After His resurrection Christ said: 'A spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see Me have.' Kagawa's teaching on the nature of man is just as anti-Christian as his teachings on the person and work of Christ. Man is not at all in need of regeneration. He is inherently good and simply needs to believe in the evolutionary development of himself into divinity. 'Belief in evolution is a bolder faith than Abraham's belief in the Promised Land. His land was the lean *country of Palestine;* the Promised Land of evolution is growth from electron to divinity.' 6) God's Word says: 'All have sinned and come far short of the glory of God.' Christ said: 'Ye must be born again.' It is the privilege of Dr. Kagawa to prefer his naturalistic philosophy to that of supernatural Christianity. But Dr. Kagawa does not have any rightful claim to the name 'evangelical.' And the fact of his being invited to speak to the one-time-evangelical Student Volunteer Movement, far from assuring us of the orthodoxy of Dr. Kagawa, convinces us of the unorthodoxy of any oragnization that welcomes his message."

Strange to say, the *Lutheran Companion* of April 18, 1936, has the following short article, signed by C. A. Wendell: —

"This Man Kagawa. — It looks as if Pietists, orthodoxists, Fundamentalists, and profiteers had entered into an agreement to squash every effort of this Kagawa of Japan. As for me, if I may venture to add a word to the tumult, I have only this to say: When I have suffered half as much for my Savior as Kagawa has; when I have surrendered every worldly preferment rather than deny Christ; when I have become humble enough to be 'Christ's fool, a public laughing-stock' (see Axling's *Kagawa*, p. 70); when I have 'ticked off, in tears, day after day, half my life' out of sympathy for suffering humanity; when I can call myself 'Christ's captive, a slave of the Cross,' determined to abandon everything that bears the mark of this world; when I have given up every luxury and every comfort and gone down into the slums, not merely to *visit* their inhabitants now and then, but to *live among them* that so I may tell them the more effectively of the love of Christ; when I have been beaten and bruised and kicked and imprisoned because of my determination to follow in the footsteps of Christ and have come out of it with my heart still full of love and compassion; when I have done all this, as Kagawa has, then maybe I shall feel justified in joining the pack and helping to hound him, — if that be the Christian thing to do, — but till then I shall let others do the judging." (C. A. WENDELL, *Lutheran Companion*, April 18, 1936.)

5) *Ibid*, p. 103.
6) Toyhiko Kagawa, *Love the Law of Life*, p. 299.

Theological Observer. — Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches.

I. Amerika.

"Do You Believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to Be the Word of God, the Only Infallible Rule of Faith and Practise?" — The *Presbyterian* of December 26, 1935, refers to this portion of the Presbyterian ordination service in an editorial headed "Dr. Chaffee's View of Scripture." The editorial deals with the matter discussed on page 308 of our magazine under the heading "The God of the Modernists." Replying to a sermon by Cardinal Hayes against birth control, eleven modernist clergymen (among them Bishop Francis J. McConnell, Dr. Edmund B. Chaffee, and Dr. Harry E. Fosdick) and two Rabbis said, among other things: "The longest argument in the Cardinal's sermon and the one upon which he ultimately bases his case is found in the statement that birth control is contrary to the commandment of the Deity. This is true if by the Deity we mean the God that is found in ancient myth and legend. This is not true, however, if by the Deity we mean the God who is revealed in the endless sweep of evolution and whose majestic message is being slowly translated by science into the accents of the human tongue. . . . If the cardinal chooses to accept the literal interpretation of the Old Testament statements as infallible doctrine, we register no complaint; nor should he complain if we choose instead to base our faith upon the evidence, the knowledge, and the experience available in our time." Quoting the paragraph in its entirety (as given on page 308 of our magazine), the *Presbyterian* goes on to say: "At the beginning of Dr. Chaffee's career as an ordained Presbyterian minister he declared before God, in the presence of a presbytery, that he 'believed the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the Word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practise.' Now he writes the above statement. Quite seriously and with entire friendliness we ask Dr. Chaffee: 'How, sir, do you reconcile those two statements?' We believe this very practical item of public testimony from a Presbyterian minister brings out in a rather striking way some of the great fissures which divide our whole Church from end to end. Is the God of Sinai 'a Deity of myth and legend'? Is God revealed 'in the endless sweep of evolution' and not in the Old Testament? Is revelation something that 'is being slowly translated by science into the accents of the human tongue' as contrasted with the 'Thus saith the Lord' of Holy Writ? Does man have to 'give sight and intelligence to what in nature is a blind and groping impulse' and thus be God to the 'God of endless evolution,' otherwise impotent, incoherent, and ignorant? *Is the Roman Catholic cardinal to be humored in his choice of 'accepting the literal interpretation of the Old Testament statements as infallible doctrine,'* while he must permit his emancipated correspondents 'if we choose, instead, to base our faith upon the evidence, the knowledge, and the experience available in our own time'"? Dr. Chaffee can do one of two things. He must either demand a reordination, in the course of which he will declare that he no longer believes the Scripture of the Old Testament to be the inspired, infallible Word of God, or he

will have to interpret his old oath of ordination to mean: "I believe the Scripture of the Old Testament to be the Word of God *in a certain sense.*"

We are constrained to put the same question: Do you believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the Word of God? to those Lutheran pastors and professors who find the Old Testament to contain, to some extent, myths and legends. Discussing a recent book, *The Old Testament — a Study*, written by a professor of the Theological Seminary at Gettysburg, CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY, May, 1935, p. 271, quotes the author as declaring that the episodes of Gen. 3 "all are pictures that belong to the naivest folk-lore period of primitive culture." "Primitive tales are thus retained and transformed [in the Old Testament]. They are given a new interpretation in the light of the teachings of the prophets." "We have encountered plenty of traces of the existence among the Hebrews of the same nature-myth as is revealed in the various Babylonian versions." This means that in the United Lutheran Church a theological teacher can deny the inspiration of parts of the Old Testament and declare that in our early Old Testament stories we have nothing but the vague and vapid Hebrew tradition which, in turn, ultimately owes its origin to kindred Semitic tradition. We are not putting the Gettysburg professor (and those who agree with him) in the same class with Drs. Chaffee and Fosdick. He does not, of course, characterize Jehovah as "a Deity of myth and legend." But he finds himself in the same situation as Dr. Chaffee with regard to the question of the *Presbyterian*: Do you believe the Scripture of the Old Testament to be the inspired Word of God? As a teacher in a seminary of the United Lutheran Church in America he subscribed to Article II, Section 1, of the constitution of this body: "The United Lutheran Church in America receives and holds the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the inspired Word of God and as the only infallible rule and standard of faith and practise, according to which all doctrines and teachers are to be judged." "The constitution of the theological seminary [Gettysburg] is a product of his [S. S. Schmucker's] own pen and contains, along with the general doctrinal position, the professorial allegiance: 'Part I . . . Article III . . . 2. Every professor-elect of this institution shall on the day of his inauguration publicly pronounce and subscribe the oath of office required of the directors and also the following declaration: 'I solemnly declare, in the presence of God and the directors of this seminary, that I do *ex animo* believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the inspired Word of God and the only perfect rule of faith and practise. . . .' . . . 3. The preceding declaration shall be repeated by each professor at the expiration of every term of five years, in the presence of the directors, and at any intermediate time if required to do so by a vote of the Board of Directors. And no man shall be retained as professor who shall refuse to make and repeat this declaration in the manner and at the times above specified.'" (V. Ferm, *The Crisis in American Lutheran Theology*, p. 78ff.) We do not know whether these provisions are, in detail, still in force at Gettysburg. But Article II, Section 1, of the constitution of the U. L. C. is certainly in force and under these provisions the professors at Gettysburg, as members of the U. L. C., certainly are held to affirm solemnly every five years, every year, every day, that they believe the Scriptures

of the Old Testament to be the inspired Word of God. What do those men who believe that the Old Testament contains in part myths and legends make of their ordination vow and professional oath? Do they mean to say that the Old Testament is inspired *in a way*? E.

Confessional Lutheranism in the Way of Unionism. — The *Christian Century* of March 25 discusses this matter under the heading "The Retreat to Dogma." The editorial says: "With the two great world conferences, 'Life and Work' and 'Faith and Order,' scheduled to meet within a little more than a year, it is important for Americans to appreciate the volume and vigor of this retreat to dogma and, if possible, to understand its meaning. A pamphlet recently issued by the continuation committee of 'Faith and Order' contains, among other materials, an article by Professor Sasse of Erlangen, which presents this point of view with uncompromising clarity. The first wide departure from proper stress upon orthodoxy, says Professor Sasse, began with the Edinburgh missionary conference of 1910. After that the German and other Continental groups fell into a common error, though with different terminology. 'Both were about equally remote from the confessions of the sixteenth century; both were influenced in roughly equal measure by the ideas of the eighteenth and nineteenth. On both sides the Christian message was interpreted in terms of that pitiful residue of ancient *credenda* which Pietism, Methodism, rationalism, and idealism had retained in current use.' He holds up to scorn such weak and spineless ideas as these: 'that the task of the Church was . . . to educate men as moral and religious personalities and so . . . "to make the world a better place to live in" (a naive American expression)'; 'Christianizing the social order'; 'saturating national life with the spirit of the Gospel'; 'the ideal of a Christian world.' All this 'was not merely an Anglo-Saxon belief; it was, below the surface, the ideal of modern Christendom as a whole.' . . . Meanwhile the American Federal Council was trying to find a way to catholicity through the unifying influence of common service. But 'that council, so excessive were its claims and so inadequate its theological basis, had failed to secure the adhesion of the three confessions having a dogmatic basis, namely, Roman Catholicism, Anglicanism, and Lutheranism.' The omission of the trinitarian formula from a preamble of the Federal Council's constitution damns it, in Professor Sasse's eyes, as 'a denominational coalition based merely on practical necessity.' 'Suppose the Federal Council's principles had been transferred to the mission-field. What is missionary work if it ceases to proclaim the "one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, begotten of His Father before all worlds, God of God, Light of Light, Very God of Very God, begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made . . ."? If the work of missions ceases to proclaim Christ *in these terms*, . . . it is no longer the forward movement of the Church of God.' And so, thinks Professor Sasse, it was the function of Lausanne to summon to a conference on unity 'only those churches which stand fast upon the basis of the ancient creeds.' And now, nine years after, 'it is recognized that a real union of the churches will only be possible if oneness in the Creed of Nicaea is presupposed. The recognition of this

principle was the most important result of the world conference at Lausanne in 1927.'"

"That being settled, then, to the satisfaction of this observer, an equally important and even more delicate task remains for Edinburgh. It is to arrive at a uniform and unanimously accepted decision upon all the doctrinal issues that have arisen since Nicaea. 'It is certain that there can be no union apart from the basis of the ancient creeds; it is equally certain that these alone do not suffice. They do not answer the questions which have stirred the mind of the Church from Augustine to Luther.' Some of these questions are specified. They have to do with the nature of grace, the relation of faith to justification, the distinction between Law and Gospel, the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in Holy Communion. Upon these and other topics different Protestant creeds state different doctrines. Whatever churches wish to unite, says Professor Sasse, it is above all things necessary that they decide which creed is right. Whatever Church would unite with the Lutheran Church must decide that the Lutheran Confession is right or else convince the Lutherans that it is wrong. 'The contribution, then, which Lutheranism has to make to the ecumenical movement at this time is its confessionalism.'"

We can well imagine the amazement of the editor of the *Christian Century*. Men in this day and age still harboring such strange, outlandish ideas! He compliments Professor Sasse indeed, saying: "It may be doubted whether a more adequate or more scholarly statement of the position of a German Lutheran can be found or one more completely free from sectarian contentiousness. There is not a quarrelsome or bittter note in it." But the queer notions the man has! "Professor Sasse, with what he doubtless hopes will be accepted as a realistic approach to the world situation, presents Lutheran confessionalism as a contribution to the ecumenical movements and hopes that agreement will be reached, among all the Christians that matter, upon all the doctrinal puzzles that have teased the brains of theologians for centuries. There must linger more than a trace of Luther's calm assurance that 'the Holy Spirit is the all-simplest Writer' and that the meaning of Scripture is perfectly clear and unmistakable to any honest man — in spite of which he felt it necessary to write a shelf of books to expound its meaning." That is a rather cheap sneer. We shall not waste space in pointing out its cheapness. But we shall take time to point out that a theological writer who characterizes the doctrines of grace, of justification, and of the distinction between Law and Gospel, matters upon which the sinner's eternal salvation depends, as "doctrinal puzzles that have teased the brains of theologians for centuries," has no conception of what Christian theology means. He should keep out of theology. He should stick to the discussion of economical and political questions. The harm he might do there would be only temporal.

The *Christian Century* next voices its objections to Professor Sasse's plan of Christian unity. It raises "the objection that the program excludes at the outset all who do not accept a view of Biblical authority and textual infallibility to which a great part of the Christian world

no longer adheres. This is a plan for the union of Fundamentalists, not of Christians." — The editor is right in his statement that confessional Lutherans will have no church-fellowship with those who deny the verbal inspiration and the absolute infallibility of the Bible, but he is wrong in stigmatizing that attitude as Fundamentalism, a sectarian aberration. It is the Christian attitude, demanded by the Bible of all Christians.

Next: "It is not that we practical and 'naive' Americans would minimize the importance of right thinking about the great doctrines of faith. It is that we deny that the Church, as the agency for doing the work of Christ in the world, is the company of those who think aright and think alike about the metaphysics of the nature of Christ, the procession of the Holy Spirit, the nature of grace, the technique of justification, and the manner of Christ's presence in the Eucharist." — Why should the editor of the *Christian Century* and those of his persuasion protest that they do not minimize the importance of right thinking about the great doctrines of faith? They know that they do that. The very next sentence proves that. The important thing is not the saving doctrine. The important thing for the Church is her "agency for doing the work of Christ in the world," meaning "the making of the world a better place for those who live in it." Again, it is evident that the *Christian Century* and the confessional Lutheran cannot think alike. There will be no union as long as confessional Lutheranism has a voice. We do insist that all Christians must think alike on grace and the person of Christ and justification. (Just drop the reference to "metaphysics" and "technique." These terms are used only in order to becloud the issue.) We do insist, we and the old-school Reformed churches, that one who does not believe in the God-man Jesus Christ and in justification by grace alone is not a Christian. And we know that all Christians *do* think alike on this matter. *Omnes Christiani "de evangelio consentiunt"* (Apology, *Trigl.*, p. 228). As to the Real Presence, all Christians *should* think alike. As long as they do not, there can be no union. And why should they not be able to think alike? It is not the Bible, but the sinful flesh which stands in the way.

Next: "One immediate effect of this type of confessionalism is to exclude from the category of the faithful all Liberals of whatever degree." — Most assuredly.

The closing paragraph reads: "It will be asked by those who make doctrinal agreement a prerequisite to fraternity and cooperation: Can two walk together except they be agreed? The answer is, Certainly they can. They must be agreed about the direction in which they will walk and at what speed and by what route. But they need not be agreed upon all the topics of which they may talk by the way." (Is the editor talking to the point?) "We should be glad to walk with Professor Sasse and with all the others who hold the creeds that he holds and to talk with them as we go of these high matters about which we do not agree. It might be, if they did not too soon cast us from their company for that lack of agreement, we might together make some progress toward the goal which we naively seek and which they also must at least desire as a station on their pilgrimage — the making of the world a better

place for those who live in it." — There it is: the chief thing, the first and last thing, on the program of the liberal churches is this-worldliness — the very thing against which Professor Sasse has been holding out from the beginning. E.

Men, Masters, and Messiahs. — Under this striking heading *Time* (April 20, 1936) presents a variegated, if not formidable, array of cultists and fanatics that recalls to one's mind the somewhat severe, but nevertheless true line of the old German Reformation hymn: "*Viel Sekten und viel Schwaermerei auf einen Haufen kommt herbei.*" — In Calumet, Mich., during the week of Easter, Father Joseph Alderic Paquet of St. Ann's Roman Catholic Church, having unlocked the tabernacle of his altar and uncovered a ciborium to distribute the consecrated host, discovered to his amazement three fresh roses, all "moistly spotted with what appeared to be blood." Father Paquet called the occurence mysterious, if not miraculous. — At Ohio State University a Jewish Rabbi, a Catholic priest, and a Methodist minister jointly conducted Holy Week services designed to allay the wide-spread Christian conviction that Jews alone were responsible for crucifying Jesus Christ. Certainly all three were crucifying Christ anew during the Holy Week of 1936. — On Good Friday, near Albuquerque, N. Mex., Los Hermanos Penitentes reenacted their bloody version of Christ's Passion with increased attention from sightseers and the Press. — In Quebec, Can., Good Friday was celebrated as a national holy-day, Mayor J. E. Gregoire ordering all theaters, public buildings, shops, etc., to be closed for the day. The citizens were directed to observe at four o'clock in the afternoon a minute of holy silence, while the city fire alarm pealed nineteen times. — In Rome, where Pope Pius XI remained in ailing privacy, Easter was the quietest in years. — In Moscow sixty thousand staunch Christians, mostly old men and women, packed the city's twenty-eight surviving churches to celebrate the feast of Christ's resurrection in spite of the fury and mockery of atheistic propagandists. — At the same time, on the morning of Easter Day, in Ollerup, Denmark, the Rev. Dr. Frank Nathan Daniel Buchman lay abed for an hour in the Hotel Gymnastik "to receive the orders of the day from God." Afterwards, in the private stadium of Physical Culturist Niels Bukh, he held what he expected would turn out to be the Oxford Group's "greatest house party." Bad weather, however, cut the attendance to about fifteen thousand persons. In the spacious stadium the United Lutheran Church pastor, inventor and promoter of what is commonly known as Buchmanism, preached to his large audience: "I challenge Denmark to be a miracle among the nations, her national policy dictated by God. . . . Denmark can demonstrate to the nations that spiritual power is the first force in the world. The true patriot gives his life to bring about his country's resurrection. All those who oppose God's control are public enemies." To his "first-century Christian fellowship" Buchman found the Danes very receptive. Among his converts he could count Dr. Hans Fuglsang Damgaard, primate of the state church (Lutheran); Dean Brodersen of the Cathedral of Copenhagen; Director Gunnar Gregersen of the National Technological Institute, the world-famous physical culturist Niels Bukh, etc. Buchmanism's prime idea is that the world needs a "moral and spiritual awakening," on the basis of absolute honesty, absolute purity, absolute

unselfishness, absolute love. Frank Buchman was born fifty-eight years ago in Pennsburg, Pa., of a Pennsylvania Dutch distilling family. He studied at Muhlenberg College, at Mount Airy Theological Seminary, became a Lutheran pastor, did welfare work for Lutheran boys at Overbrook, Pa., quarreled with the trustees of his hospice, went to England with a bitter heart, had a "stirring, heart-warming religious experience" in 1908, in a rural English church, received new spiritual powers, which enable him to "probe" souls and "cleanse" them by extracting confessions, invaded British and United States colleges, became famous for his "house parties," persuaded people publicly to "share" their sins, — mostly, as *Time* remarks, misdeeds of a sexual nature. Buchmanism "radiates good fellowship." The founder laughs a great deal, often signs his letters "Yours merrily, Frank," declares the letters P-R-A-Y to stand for "Powerful Radiograms Always Yours." Buchmanism, now about twenty years old, still rallies around one man. Rom Landau in his book, just off the press, *God Is My Adventure* (Doubleday, Doran) calls Frank Buchman "the most successful and shrewdest revivalist of our time," but condemns the Buchman movement as "theologically frivolous." — Besides Buchman, Author Landau, a thirty-seven-year-old Pole, lists in his new book also Shri Sadgaru Meher Baba, a "long-haired, silky-mustached Parsee," who four years ago came to the United States. He is addressed by his followers as the "God-man," the "Messiah," the "Perfect Master." Fanatic Meher Baba never speaks, has been silent since 1925, professes himself to be in an "infinite state," into which he fell when he kissed an ancient holy woman named Hazrat Babajan, an act which threw him into a coma that lasted nine months. — Every Easter Monday large posters in front of the Albert Hall in London announce Easter services of the Elim Foursquare Revivalists (not connected with Sister Aimee Semple McPherson's Four-square Gospel Church in Los Angeles), led by Welshman George Jeffreys, who knows how to whip up to hot fervor his praying, swaying, singing, shouting audience. Jeffreys professes to be a literal Bible-believer, practises baptism by immersion, has healed his own facial paralysis by prayer, and now heals patients who suffer from paralysis, blindness, tumors, cancers, etc. In the past nine months more than one hundred and fifty persons have solemnly sworn that Jeffreys has cured them by prayer from ailments such as those just mentioned. — Twenty seven years ago Mrs. Annie Besant and Rev. Chas. Leadbeater, famed theosophists, declared Jiddu Krishnamurti, Brahman Hindu, to be the "Vehicle of the new World Teacher," the Lord Maitreya, whose last incarnation on earth was Jesus Christ. Krishnamurti, at that time a twelve-year-old moppet, calmly accepted Annie Besant's announcement; but in 1929 he renounced the enforced godship, though he is still a practising theosophist seer, living near Ojai, Cal. Lecture tours in Mexico, South America, Holland, and elsewhere have during the last years occupied much of his time. — An unaccountable modern mystic is the "Harmonious Developer," George Ivanovitch Gurdjieff, a "Levantine with a huge, shaved head, piercing eyes, walrus mustache, and a bull-muscled frame." He is the strange head of an odd cult, which such people as the late novelist Katharine Mansfield, the late editor Alfred Richard Orage of the *New English Weekly*, and others have at one time or another espoused. At Fontainebleau, France,

Gurdjieff used to conduct the Institute for the Harmonious Development of Man, where he taught his followers intricate dances, for which he composed more than five thousand pieces of music. Six years ago Harmonious Developer Gurdjieff came to Manhattan, where he wrote a monumental work, *Tales Told by Beelzebub to His Grandson.* — In Los Angeles the local ministerial association discovered a huge swindle concern which for a small sum (ca. $10) conferred on applicants such titles as Doctor of Divinity, Bishop, etc. Among those who received an ordination certificate, together with the Doctor title, was also the Rev. Drake Googoo, who upon investigation turned out to be none other than Funnyman Joe Penner's famous duck. — Indeed *"viel Sekten und viel Schwaermerei,"* together with much mockery and blasphemy, which *Time* has most skilfully presented in its interesting and instructive article "Men, Masters, and Messiahs"! And what about our dear Lutheran Church in this dreadful inundation of spiritual delusions? The old command "Preach the Gospel" still stands and still must be followed. J. T. M.

Attitude of the Roman Catholic Church and the Protestant Churches toward the Bible. — In a review of Dr. Machen's recent book *The Christian Faith in the Modern World* the *American*, a Roman Catholic weekly, says: "In popular language Dr. Machen develops the Scriptural proofs for the fundamental Christian doctrines of the nature and existence of God, the blessed Trinity, and the divinity of Christ. Painfully aware of the doctrinal chaos in the various Protestant churches, he meets and refutes from the Bible the chief forms of error or skepticism that for years have been sapping the vitality of Protestantism and have brought it to its present state of helplessness and indifference. As a modern, courageous, and able defense of the essentials of faith, his book deserves sympathetic reading. Its great fault is due to the original sin of Protestantism in rejecting the authority of Christ's Church and proclaiming the Bible as the only rule of faith and conduct. . . . The most potent fact in the modern world and in religious history since the days of Luther is that the attempt to get along without the infallible guidance of the true Church leads only to heresy and disunion. In true Protestant style Dr. Machen cheerfully claims to solve every spiritual problem by the Bible."

From the words just quoted it is evident that the Roman Catholic Church does not accept the Bible as the only rule of faith and conduct, but subjects it to the interpretation of the Church, meaning thereby the Roman Catholic Church (the traditions and the Pope speaking "infallibly" *ex cathedra*). This wrong attitude of the Roman Catholic Church toward the Bible is of course well known. But the Roman Catholic reviewer of Dr. Machen's book is not so well acquainted with the attitude which many Protestants take toward the Bible as he thinks he is. He attributes the "doctrinal chaos in the various churches" to the acceptance of the Bible on the part of the Protestant churches as the only rule of faith and life. But this is exactly what many Protestant churches, all those in the Reformed group and some others, are not doing; they are making essentially the same mistake that the Roman Catholic Church makes. While the Roman Catholic Church subjects the Bible to the interpretation of the Church, always meaning thereby the Roman Catholic Church,

the Reformed group of churches among the Protestants subject the Bible to an interpretation of their own human reason. In the final analysis both the Roman Catholic Church and the Reformed churches are doing essentially the same thing: they are subjecting the Bible to the judgment of human reason. In theory the Reformed churches accept the Bible as the only rule of faith and life, but not in practise. We should rather say that they did this years ago; many are not even doing that much now. Over against the Roman Catholic Church and the Reformed group of Protestants the Lutheran Church, wherever she has remained true to her Confessions, is the only Church which accepts the Bible *both in theory and practise* as the only rule of faith and life. And we do most emphatically insist that the Bible needs no interpretation, but that its statements are clear and can have but one meaning. When Paul wrote his epistles to the Christian congregations of his day, he expected the members of those churches to whom his letters were addressed to read and understand them. The psalmist says: "Thy Word is a lamp unto my feet and a light unto my path," Ps. 119, 105. J. H. C. Fritz.

New Ten Commandments. — At a recent meeting the Philadelphia Methodist Conference accepted a report of its social service commission which embodied ten social commandments. On account of the frequency with which sociological topics are discussed nowadays, we submit these commandments to our readers.

"We can remember the words of Christ: 1) 'Give ye them to eat.' 2) We can cultivate a social conscience, so that any social injustice done to a brother man may instantly be recognized as a sin against the heavenly Father. 3) We can refuse to recognize any one as converted to Christ until he has been converted to a passion for righteousness and to a willingness to suffer for the emancipation of the oppressed, among whom are the Negro, the unemployed, sweat-shop slaves, and dwellers in the slums. 4) We can more carefully measure all human relationships by the teachings of One who said: 'I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life.' With those much-disturbed Methodist laymen of Chicago we believe that there should be a Scriptural basis for the Church's position on economic questions. But we also contend that the social gospel is an inevitable development of the message of Jesus. Unless we proclaim it, we are disloyal to the Christ and are expediting the ruin of civilization. 5) Believing with Kagawa that 'the love of Christ must be expressed through economics,' we can engage in a sympathetic study of the cooperative movements, especially the Rochdale system, as a method of rebuilding the social order by democratic processes rather than through methods of force. 6) Proud of that select group of Methodist young people who think it nobler to go to prison as a Christian pacifist than to go to the battle-field as a national hero, we can teach that 'the moral equivalent for war' is found in being 'continuously and dangerously' engaged in rebuilding the social order in accord with the Sermon on the Mount. 7) We can actively promote constructive social legislation. 8) We hold that war is not only a sin, but 'the most colossal and ruinous social sin that afflicts mankind to-day,' since it involves not only the slaughter of human beings, but fosters lying instead of truth, breeds hatred instead

of love, substitutes military necessity for the Moral Law, and nullifies in a few months that which has taken the Church a generation to develop in human character. 9) International wars must be forestalled by the readjustment of national laws, tariffs, and resources, so that congested populations may have the necessities of life through the Christian method of international sharing. Civil wars must be forestalled also by a process of sharing the fruits of toil with the toiler as well as with the investor. 10) The labor question is more than a problem of economic organization, because it deals with the coronation of the common man and the construction of a social order which includes 'bread, brotherhood, and freedom.' Of these three, Communism offers only the bread, but 'man cannot live by bread alone.' Fascism repudiates brotherhood. Socialism in practise may evolve into a denial of freedom. Our hope is in democracy in every area of human life. This civilization cannot endure permanently half autocratic and half democratic." A.

Brief Items. — How much the race question is still a live issue became evident in a declaration of John J. Cornwell, former governor of West Virginia, with respect to the resolutions of the Episcopal Church League for Industrial Democracy, advocating not only rejection of the antisedition bills which have been introduced in Congress, but likewise equality between whites and Negroes in the official positions of the Church. As the *Living Church* reports, he said: "If that is going to be the doctrine of the Protestant Episcopal Church, I am going to do what Al. Smith said he'd do — I shall take a walk." — From the East comes the unusual news that Dr. Archey D. Ball, minister of First Methodist Church, Englewood, N. J., has been requested not to return when his present year of service is ended. The conservative members of his congregation, so we are told, are dissatisfied with the liberal preaching and the social gospel of their pastor. The papers describe him as a strong crusader against war and Fascism and other matters which advocates of the social gospel have put on the black list. — Dr. Kraeling of Yale Divinity School has published the text of a little parchment fragment found in Dura-Europos, on the Euphrates, in 1933. According to the editor this fragment belongs to Tatian's *Diatessaron* and gives a part of the account of the burial of our Lord. It seems the fragment belongs to the first half of the third century, and we have evidence now that the *Diatessaron* was originally written in Greek, not in Syriac, as was held by many experts in former years. Recent discoveries in the field of manuscripts having to do with the New Testament almost lead a person to hold his breath and ask, What's next? — Quoting from a pamphlet which has the title *The Mob Still Rides*, the *Christian Century* informs its readers that of the eighty-four persons lynched from 1931 to the close of 1935, forty-one per cent. "were either not even accused of crime or were charged with only minor offenses; that of the other fifty-nine per cent. many were certainly innocent of the crimes with which they were charged; that only a fourth of the victims were so much as accused of actual or attempted assaults on women, — the usual cause alleged to justify mob killings; and that in a number of these cases the commission's investigators could find no convincing evidence of guilt." The commission in question is the Commission on Inter-

racial Cooperation. — The *Allgemeine Ev.-Luth. Kirchenzeitung* reports a notice which appeared in a Russian paper, that recently again ten priests were exiled or shot. In Siberia the authorities have prohibited Christian burial or the reading of masses for the dead. People who accord a Christian burial to their deceased are disfranchised. — In the *Lutheran* of April 9 Dr. J. L. Neve of Hamma Divinity School sounds a very clear note on the meaning of the death of Christ, setting forth the teaching of the vicarious atonement. "He, the Holy One, tasted death in our place. His death has a vicarious significance; it has the significance of the One dying for all men." We hope that this is the teaching on the meaning of the Cross which obtains in the U. L. C. in general. — A campaign against atheism and Communism in the United States was decided upon at a conference held recently at Richmond, Va., attended by religious and lay leaders. Significantly the place of meeting was old St. John's Church, where Patrick Henry uttered the famous sentence "Give me liberty or give me death." The movement is to be called America for God. Several bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church and one of the Methodist Church are among the clergymen sponsoring this endeavor. — *Svenskyrkotidnig* reports the following: "The Roman Catholic Church again lifts its proud head in Bohemia. The World War brought on a revolt against the Catholic Church, and some two million Catholics became Evangelicals. The Catholic Church, nothing daunted, began in a quiet way to regain its lost territory. Able priests were appointed; a Catholic party was organized in politics; Catholic diplomats found their way into the adminstration and in every position of vantage. Last year there was held at Prague a general Catholic Day, in which the Roman Catholic Church celebrated its come-back. A Catholic laymen's movement has been organized. A bitter and merciless fight against the Evangelicals is on. Marriages, for example, are broken up by Catholic interference. Christian toleration is daily receiving a blow in the face. Bohemia is getting a whiff from the Middle Ages." *N. L. C. N. B.* — "The second precept of the Church — to receive the blessed Sacrament three times a year at the least, of which Easter is to be one — is embodied in the English and Canadian prayer-books in the rubrics of the Communion office. The Roman Church demands once only. The first part of the precept (the reception) is a divine law, and wilful disregard is a mortal sin; the rest of it (the number of times) is ecclesiastical law, disregard of which is a grave sin." So writes an Episcopalian rector in the *Living Church*. A passage which is *apropos* is Matt. 15, 9: "In vain do they worship Me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." — Liverpool Cathedral in England became somewhat of a storm center when on a certain Sunday in March one of the canons drew the attention of the audience to the omission in the prayers of the invocation of blessings on what the ministers of the state were proposing to do. According to the canon the government officials were not pursuing a course dedicated to truth and peace, and therefore the Church would only stultify itself if it offered prayer for the success of the government in its undertakings. What strikes us is that the church dignitaries were not satisfied with suppressing the customary prayer, but felt they ought to comment on it before the assembled congregation, which made the whole affair take on a theatrical aspect. — While

Harvard University is celebrating its tercentenary, Union Seminary in New York is observing its centenary. The latter occasion is to be made memorable by the raising of a fund of $403,000 for the maintenance of faculty members who retire. A friend of the school has promised $150,000 if the remaining amount will be raised by others by June 3. It is surprising to see what funds people will provide to assist in the preaching of a gospel which refers mainly to the present life. — The Episcopalians lost a famous missionary bishop, the Right Reverend John McKim, who gave fifty-four years to the work of his Church in Japan. He died in Honolulu at the age of eighty-three. — The Presbytery of New York has refused to obey the Presbyterian General Assembly, which in 1934 and 1935 ordered that ecclesiastical proceedings be instituted against members of the Independent Board of Foreign Missions, one of whose members belongs to this presbytery. The motive does not seem to be endorsement of the stand of the Independent Board, which opposes Modernism, but a desire to avoid controversy. Will the Assembly now include the powerful New York Presbytery among the rebels of whose disloyalty it complains? — Sherwood Eddy, while maintaining that the Soviet government is "seeking to give equal justice to all the poor, to all the masses, to end unemployment, poverty, and injustice," nevertheless says that for him acceptance of the position of this government is morally impossible because 1. its denial of political and civil liberties; 2. the violence of its continuing revolution; 3. its harsh dogmatic atheism. (Abridged from *N. L. C. B.*) — From August 30 to September 4, under the auspices of the National Conference of Jews and Christians, the National Seminar will be held for Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish leaders at Hartford, Conn. Discussing general subjects, such as "The Religious Issues Presented by Science," "The Issues Presented by the Totalitarian States of the World," "Methods of Training the Clergy," selected at random from a formidable list, the debaters undoubtedly will valiantly endeavor to avoid stepping on each other's toes. — In 1928 the contributions received in Protestant churches of the United States amounted to $532,368,714. In 1935 the total was $304,672,999, which means there was a decrease of forty-three per cent. If all of the work done by the Federal Council of Churches, whose secretaries and clerks are responsible for this information, were of such an enlightening type, we could regard its activities with more complacency. — At the convention of the National Education Association held recently in St. Louis, the statement was made that of the twelve million Negroes in our country eighty per cent. are literate and that Negro colleges last year had an enrolment of twenty-five thousand. A.

II. Ausland.

Pöhlmanns „Bekenntnis, Bekenntnisſtand, Bekennen" noch einmal. Unter der Überſchrift „Verkehrte Urteile über Schrift und Bekenntnis" haben wir bereits in den Spalten des "Theological Observer" (cf. Vol. VII, No. 5, Mainummer 1936, S. 385 ff.) auf die falſche Stellung aufmerkſam gemacht, die die modern-rationaliſtiſche Theologie, wie immer ſie ſich jeweilig nennen mag, der Schrift und dem Bekenntnis gegenüber einnimmt. Noch klarer als in dem vorigen Artikel kommt dieſe falſche Stellung in

Fortsetzung III des Pöhlmannschen Aufsatzes zum Ausdruck. (Vgl. „A. E. L. K." Nr. 5, 69. Jahrg., 31. Januar 1936, 5. S. 98.) Gegen Schluß des Artikels schreibt Pöhlmann nämlich: „Auch der Theolog hat, sofern er ein echter und rechter Theolog ist, Gottes Geist und hat darum die Vollmacht, alles, was an geistlichem Erkenntnisgut sich auf dem Weg von Menschenmund und Menschenhand in den Sinnbildern, in den Symbolen von Schrift und Bekenntnis [Man bedenke, was es damit auf sich hat, daß man die Bibel ein Symbol nennt!] Ausdruck verschafft hat, geistlich zu beurteilen und geistlich zu richten. Aber freilich, indem der Theolog sich auf solchen Höhenwegen ergeht, befindet er sich in einer unheimlichen, furchterregenden Lage. Während er die Schrift eben als Schrift seiner kritischen Beurteilung unterwirft, ruft ihn aus ihr heraus das lebendige Wort Gottes an, das kräftig und schärfer als jedes zweischneidige Schwert ist, und kritisiert die Erwägungen und Gedanken seines Herzens mit einer Hellsichtigkeit und Klarheit, daß nichts vor ihm verborgen bleibt, vielmehr alles bloß und aufgedeckt vor seinen Augen liegt, Hebr. 4, 12 f. Die in den relativen Strom menschlichen Erzeugnisses hineingezogene Heilige Schrift steht als lebendiges Wort Gottes wieder in aller absoluten Größe und Herrlichkeit, in aller majestätischen Eingeborenheit vor ihrem Kritiker und verweist ihn zur tiefsten Demut. Der Theolog darf und soll die Schrift und ihre Bücher daraufhin kritisch prüfen, ob und wiefern sie Christum treiben. [Von uns unterstrichen.] Aber er kann das nur, wenn und sofern er selbst von Christus getrieben wird. Kann dann — von Christus und seinem Geist getrieben! — solche Kritik überhaupt zu Hochmut führen und in Hochmut geübt werden? Sie kann ja nur in die tiefste Demut führen und in tiefster Demut geübt werden. Und ähnlich wie es mit der Beurteilung der Schrift steht, steht es mit der Beurteilung der Symbole durch den Theologen. Während er sich anschickt, sie zu kritisieren, ruft ihn aus ihnen heraus das Theologengeschlecht der großen Kampfzeiten der Kirchengeschichte an, sie so zu üben, daß sie von tiefster Ehrfurcht vor den Vätern der großen Epochen getragen wird. Das quatenus, mit dem die jeweilige Theologie an Schrift und Symbole herantritt, um sie keinesfalls nach und in dem jeweiligen Zeitgeist, sondern an Christus und in seinem Geist zu prüfen, besteht zu Recht; aber es ist seinerseits wieder bestimmt durch das quatenus einer demütigen und ehrfürchtigen Haltung." Wir zitieren diese Sätze zumeist, weil sich Pöhlmann mit seiner Forderung, die Schrift kritisieren zu dürfen, auf Luther beruft, und zwar an der Hand der bekannten Stelle, die D. Pieper in seinem großen Werk „Christliche Dogmatik" gegen Rationalisten von der Art Pöhlmanns so trefflich in Schutz genommen hat. (Vgl. Christl. Dogm., Bd. I, S. 353 ff.) Sich auf Luther beziehend, schreibt Pöhlmann: „Hat nicht der große Theolog D. Martin Luther in seiner Vorrede auf die Episteln St. Jakobi und Judas 1522 gesagt: ‚Auch ist das der rechte Prüfstein, alle Bücher zu tadeln, wenn man siehet, ob sie Christum treiben oder nicht. . . . Was Christum nicht lehret, das ist nicht apostolisch, wenn's gleich Petrus oder Paulus lehrt; wiederum was Christum predigt, das ist apostolisch, wenn's gleich Judas, Annas, Pilatus und Herodes tät'.'" Daran knüpft Pöhlmann die Bemerkung: „Ob die biblischen Bücher Christum treiben oder nicht! So gilt denn ein quatenus, und zwar ein höchst wichtiges, auch für die Schrift und infolgedessen erst recht für das Symbol." Aber Pöhl-

mann kann sich hier nicht mit Luther decken; denn Luther redet von einem angenommenen Fall und nicht von einem wirklichen. Die Schriften der Propheten und Apostel, also die kanonischen Bücher der Heiligen Schrift, hat Luther nie danach beurteilt, ob sie Christum treiben oder nicht. Für ihn *trieben* A PRIORI *alle Christum*, Apost. 10, 43. Der Unterschied zwischen Luther und Pöhlmann besteht darin, daß Luther die Heilige Schrift für Gottes eingegebenes Wort hielt, und zwar von A bis Z. Pöhlmann aber glaubt, daß die Heilige Schrift „sich auf dem Weg von Menschenmund und Menschenhand Ausdruck verschafft hat" und daß sie „in den relativen Strom menschlichen Erzeugnisses hineingezogen" worden ist. Mit andern Worten, die Schrift ist nach Pöhlmann ein halb göttliches, halb menschliches Machwerk, so daß es des Theologen business wird, sie danach zu kritisieren, inwiefern sie Christum treibt. Nach Pöhlmann soll dies allerdings mit der nötigen Demut und Ehrfurcht geschehen. Pöhlmann übersieht aber, daß es so etwas wie eine demütige und ehrfurchtsvolle Kritik des Wortes Gottes gar nicht gibt. Hier ist *jede* Kritik ein crimen laesae maiestatis, ein Majestätsverbrechen gegen den göttlichen Autor der Schrift. Übrigens hat es auch, wie die Dogmengeschichte bezeugt, noch nie einen rationalistischen Kritiker gegeben, der bei seiner Kritik der Schrift auch nur einigermaßen demütig und ehrfurchtsvoll verfuhr. Im Gegenteil, sie haben alle den Mund sehr voll genommen und die Schrift auf Ungenauigkeit, Unwahrheit und Betrug hin angeklagt. So ist es denn auch klar, daß bei der Kritik der Heiligen Schrift nicht der Geist Christi den ungläubigen Theologen treibt, sondern der Geist Satans, Joh. 8, 44, des Vaters der Lüge. Pöhlmann stellt somit an diesem Punkt alles auf den Kopf. Aber auch bei dem, was er über die Symbole schreibt. Er sagt, bei der Kritik der Symbole ermahne den Theologen zur rechten Kritik „das Theologengeschlecht der großen Kampfzeiten der Kirchengeschichte". Man könnte dies allenfalls stehen lassen. Aber der Gedanke, der sich in diesen Worten ausspricht, ist durchaus nicht unschuldig. Was dem Theologen die unschickliche Kritik an dem Bekenntnis verwehrt, ist nicht ein altes Theologengeschlecht, sondern die Schrift allein. Was nach der Schrif am Bekenntnis recht ist, das bleibt bestehen; was aber nach der Schrift am Bekenntnis verkehrt ist (wir nehmen natürlich bei unserm lutherischen Bekenntnis kein quatenus an, sondern unterschreiben nur quia), das fällt dahin, und wenn es auch ein Luther, ein Augustinus usw. gesagt haben sollte. *Menschlich* will Pöhlmann die Schrift kritisieren, menschlich will er aber auch bei der Beurteilung des Symbols in Schranken gehalten werden. Und gerade auch an diesem Punkt zeigt sich bei ihm nicht etwa eine demütige und ehrfurchtsvolle Unterstellung unter Gottes Wort, sondern ein hochmütiges Dem-Wort-Trotzbieten, ein Meistern des Worts, das mit dem der Schlange im Paradies blut- und knochenverwandt ist. Pöhlmanns Artikel dient nicht zur Klarheit, dient auch nicht dazu, daß die Schrift wieder nach ihrer vollen Verwertung zu Ehren kommt. Bei ihm findet sich kein „Zurück zur Reformation", sondern nur eine Abwendung von der Reformation, und zwar nach Art des Tridentinums. J. T. M.

Todesfälle. Zwei bekannte Theologen sind kürzlich gestorben. In Berlin-Grunewald starb der dort im Ruhestand lebende Prof. D. Erich Schäder im Alter von fünfundsiebzig Jahren. Er war Professor in Kiel, Greifswald

und Breslau. In Bonn starb der Alttestamentler D. Ed. König im Alter von fast neunzig Jahren. Er hat seine Lehrtätigkeit in Leipzig, Rostock und Bonn (seit 1900) ausgeübt und ist durch viele Schriften bekannt geworden. (Ev.-Luth. Freikirche.)

Anglican Tendencies in Scandinavian Countries. — Dr. John A. Morehead, the former president of the Lutheran World Convention, feels he must say a word in defense of the Lutheran churches of Northern Europe, concerning which the statement was recently made that they seem to be favoring rather strongly union with the Church of England. He says in an article appearing in the *National Lutheran Council News Bulletin:* "In the first place, it is quite true that there is in Sweden and in other Scandinavian countries a small coterie of leaders who are interested in the possibility of affiliations with the Church of England because of their common possession of the so-called Apostolic Succession. But, using Sweden as an example, the powerful Pastors' Association of the Church of Sweden, including its bishops and clergy, as well as the congregations of the Church in that country, while they value, sentimentally, their historic church organization, are overwhelmingly one with their fellow-Lutherans in other lands in the conviction that external organization and ceremonies are not essential to Christian church unity, but solely agreement in the essential doctrines of the Christian religion according to the Scriptural teachings of Article VII of the Augsburg Confession. In the second place, it should be remembered that the approach to the Scandinavian Lutheran churches was made by the Church of England through official commissions appointed to these churches by the last Lambeth Conference. In the third place, I take pleasure in testifying to the fact that my own visits in recent years to Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and Finland have established me firmly in the conviction that the churches of these Scandinavian countries are inwardly and truly Evangelical Lutheran in their faith; that they are anchored in this faith; that they are devoted to it; and that they are giving distinguished service to the esablishment of this faith of the Gospel on the earth. . . . In the fourth place, the Lutheran churches of the Scandinavian countries reveal their inner faith, spiritual affinities, and purposed relationships by their records. The pastoral associations of these countries have officially invited the executive committee of the Lutheran World Convention to send representatives to their meetings in former years. Such invitations have been accepted with pleasure, and happy visitations and contacts have resulted."

After recounting the interest which the Lutherans of Scandinavian countries have manifested in the Lutheran World Convention and in Lutheran work in general, Dr. Morehead concludes this part of his essay thus: "In short, while the German professor through some apparent exercise of his creative imagination (disturbed, unfortunately, by his own ecclesiastical affairs and anxiety) has produced the generalization of some intellectual interest, it does seem perfectly clear that his conclusions are entirely out of harmony with the existing inner facts of the situation. Personally I am utterly convinced of the inner unity of the Lutheran churches of the Scandinavian countries with the historic body of world Lutheranism as well as with the agency of the Lutheran World Convention, which from

the beginning the Lutheran churches of Scandinavia have a noble part, under God's blessing, in creating and developing."

While it may be a far cry from Canterbury and Oxford to Upsala and Oslo, Dr. Sasse, the German professor referred to by Dr. Morehead, very properly pointed a warning finger to negotiations between the Anglicans and Scandinavian Lutherans which, even if not resulting in, or intended to result in, actual union or absorption, must help to promote the doctrinal indifference from which Christianity is suffering. A.

Religious Conditions in England Startling. — In the *Presbyterian* of April 2 parts of a letter written by an Englishman are published who paints a very gloomy picture of the religious situation in England. He writes: "Christian work becomes increasingly difficult. The Sabbath social habits of the masses have completely changed, and when the older generation has passed, the problem of the churches will be more difficult still. The Church is losing its hold, especially in the suburbs. Think of Beacontree, Essex! Population, 125,000. Total church accommodation, 10,000. It is said that there are 90,000 children on the Dagenham Estate, and 80,000 of them are outside Sabbath-schools. There is no room for them, even if there were the desire to attend. Viewing the present situation, I see things as follows: 1. Sabbath social habits are changed and fixed, and this is unrealized by the churches. 2. Churches and missions are content to go on in the same old grooves. 3. Open-air work is practically futile, for street noises have increased to such an extent that voices are drowned. I saw a fine band of open-air workers in London, and not a soul listening. The noise of the traffic was terrible. 4. I believe the Church, as presently organized, will have to change its methods. Smaller churches, with unpaid pastors, as in the early days, will need to be substituted for the present order of things. 5. The Church of England, and also of Scotland, have unbounded wealth in tithes and can therefore keep the old order going though no one attends. The vicar of the village here where I live complains that at Communion the sexton and himself are often the only communicants. (The vicar's salary is $1,850 and manse.) 6. Non-conformist churches are going to have a struggle to exist because self-supporting, and worshipers are on the decrease. 7. Although the habits of the people are fixed, they were even worse before the evangelical revival of the nineteenth century and can be changed again as then. But I am convinced that education and scientific progress make the situation more difficult. If the vast masses outside are to be touched, then the Christian Church must outlive the world. All the preaching in the world will not move this present generation until there is that in the lives of ministers and members which will break through the thick crust of indifference and cause men to stop and think and wonder, as was the case with the pagans in the early days of Christianity. 8. The Gospel still has its ancient power, but Christians must prove it if the world is to be convinced and saved. 9. Possibly we are nearer the return of our Lord than we realize. Yet this is no reason why we should shirk the problem."

Very much of what is said here applies to conditions in the United States also and should be read and pondered by us with a prayerful heart. A.

Book Review. — Literatur.

Das Markus-Evangelium. Überſetzt und ausgelegt von Lic. Dr. Wilhelm Herbſt, Pfarrer am Eliſabeth-Diakoniſſen- und Krankenhaus, Berlin. 171 Seiten 5½×8¼. Preis: Kartoniert, RM. 2.90; Ganzleinen, RM. 3.80.

Ausgewählte Pfalmen. Überſetzt und ausgelegt von Jakob Kröker, Direktor des Miſſionsbundes „Licht im Oſten". 163 Seiten 5½×8¼. Preis: Kartoniert, RM. 2.80; Ganzleinen, RM. 3.70. — Beide Bücher ſind im Verlag von Guſtav Schlößmann, Leipzig und Hamburg, erſchienen.

Dies ſind zwei weitere Bände in der Serie „Bibelhilfe für die Gemeinde". Beide Bücher haben dieſelbe Anlage. Am Anfang eines jeden Abſchnitts wird eine wörtliche Überſetzung geboten, worauf dann eine Betrachtung folgt, mit beſonderer Anwendung auf die kirchlichen Verhältniſſe Deutſchlands, obgleich dies nicht ſtörend hervortritt. Die Stellung beider Bücher zu der Lutherſchen Exegeſe wird gekennzeichnet durch den folgenden Paſſus aus der Einleitung zum 22. Pſalm: „Wir haben es hier alſo mit einem meſſianiſchen Pſalm zu tun. Nicht etwa in dem Sinne, als ob ſich eine große innerliche Perſönlichkeit in Israel hingeſetzt und den Leidensweg JEſu Chriſti beſchrieben hätte. Ob David, ob Jeremia oder ob ſonſt jemand der Großen in der Geſchichte Israels, hier beſchreibt zunächſt ein Menſch ſeinen eigenen ſchweren Leidensweg." Wer ſo ſchreibt, hat noch keinen Einblick gewonnen in das Weſen der meſſianiſchen Weisſagungen und weiß noch nicht, was Inſpiration und Prophetie bedeutet. So brauchbar die beiden Bücher für den Theologen ſind, der ſcharf zu unterſcheiden weiß, ſo gefährlich ſind ſie für den Laien, der den Grundtext nicht nachſchlagen kann. Man dürfte ſich auch in Deutſchland an der Schriftauslegung bilden, wie ſie ſich bei Luther und neuerdings bei Stöckhardt in ſeiner „Bibliſchen Geſchichte" und in ſeinen Advents- und Paſſionspredigten findet. P. E. Kretzmann.

The Memoirs of St. Peter, or The Gospel According to St. Mark. Translated into English Sense-lines by *James A. Kleist, S. J., Ph. D.*, Professor of Classical Languages at St. Louis University. The Bruce Publishing Company, Milwaukee, Wis. 217 pages, 6×9. Price, $2.50.

The Gospel of St. Mark. Presented in Greek Thought-units and Sense-lines, with a Commentary by *James A. Kleist, S. J., Ph. D.* Same publishers. 267 pages, 6×9. Price, $3.50.

It will be news to a number of my readers that, when they studied Kaegi's *Greek Grammar* in its English version they sat at the feet of the eminent scholar who wrote these two volumes; for he is the translator of that well-known school manual. Coming as an old acquaintance, whose appearance awakens fond memories, he can be sure of a respectful hearing. It is difficult to restrain one's enthusiasm in speaking of the double achievement of the author represented by these books and of the fine workmanship which they exhibit from the printer's point of view. Whoever in this utilitarian age still admires genuine scholarship and artistic printing will be delighted with them. While Dr. Kleist is a Roman Catholic and his adherence to the decrees of Trent becomes evident now and then, these works are not at all controversial, but simply aim to make the Gospel according to St. Mark a better-understood book and to furnish the student

with the needed means of solving the many linguistic and historical questions which a careful reading of the original brings to his notice.

The first volume, dedicated "to all plain folk that love the good tidings of St. Mark," contains as its main section a translation of the gospel printed in "sense-lines," that is, in lines each one of which represents a group of words making a unit and spoken without a stop. It is an arrangement which extraordinarily facilitates the reading and understanding of the text. We had better let the author himself explain the meaning of "sense-lines." He writes (p. 24): "Long before the New Testament came into existence and long after it was finished, there was among Greek authors a wide-spread custom of writing their prose as well as their poetry in the colometric style. This means that line after line of the manuscript, instead of being filled up to capacity, would contain only what the Greeks called a *colon*, that is, a smaller or larger division of the period, or composite sentence. Now it was the characteristic of a *colon* that it should by itself 'make sense.' Consequently a text 'printed in sense-lines' must quite frequently coincide with the same text if written in the ancient colometric way; for a sense-line, as we here understand the term, is precisely a line that by itself makes sense. To illustrate: Our Lord's inaugural sermon, recorded by St. Mark in 1, 15, corresponds exactly to four ancient *cola* and is here printed in four sense-lines: The time of waiting is ended, — The kingdom of God is come. — Be converted — And believe the message of salvation." Our author thinks it possible that the gospels and the epistles of St. Paul were written in this manner; for, as he points out, it was a method of writing in vogue at the time of Christ, and several centuries later Jerome used it in his translation of the Bible. In the translation of St. Mark submitted here archaic forms and expressions like "thou," "ye," "straightway," "damsel," are avoided. Having compared large sections of it with the original, it appears to me to be an excellent rendering. In addition, the first volume contains an investigation of the isagogical questions pertaining to the second gospel, and conservative, satisfying conclusions are reached. Brief notes on special points in the text and theological comment on important statements or expressions constitute the chief contribution in the concluding section.

In the second volume we enter a different realm, that of technical Greek scholarship, and some acquaintance with this language, not necessarily of an extensive kind, is presupposed throughout. According to the author this book is intended both for beginners of Greek and for such as wish to enter upon advanced work in New Testament Greek. Here the Greek text of St. Mark is reprinted in "sense-lines," or in colometric arrangement, explained above, and it is remarkable to what an extent this aids one in quickly apprehending the meaning. In the section that follows colometry is dwelt on at length, and a number of other matters that have to do with style, a field in which Dr. Kleist is an acknowledged master, are discussed. Brief notes on special passages follow, commenting on grammatical and lexicographical questions, next a list of Greek words with their English equivalents, and finally several valuable appendices. Those who wish to gain more intimate glimpses of what a thorough knowledge of Greek means for the understanding of the New Testament are encouraged to acquire this volume.

W. Arndt.

The Compulsion of Love, or Jesus and the Woman at the Well. By *Paul J. Dundorf, Ph. D.*, Greenville, Pa. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich. 1935. 156 pages, 5¼×7¾. Price, $1.00.

This is a series of meditations on John 4, devotions built up around the story as found in John 4. The author teaches salvation by grace. Some passages are forceful and epigrammatic and will give the reader some good material. The author includes everything, from a discussion of the viewpoints of Puritanism to thoughts on vested choirs. Passages like the following show the style of the book: "It is better to build the fence around the precipice and keep a young life from falling over it than to have the ambulance below to hasten the patient to the hospital after the fall. Christ longs to have His dwelling-place in the child and youth and keep the soul from falling into sin." (P. 79.) "God has a cosmic relationship to the world, which is different in its meaning from the personal relationship He bears to us. The presence of God in nature is different from His presence in us. . . . God is the Creator of nature, but not the Father of nature in the sense that He is our Father." (P. 93.) — It was necessary to place a few queries. On page 31 the author allows millions of years for the creation of the world. Page 46 carries a chiliastic and unionistic tone. On page 107 the Sacraments are spoken of as "an outward sign which carries with it an inner significance." Page 111 seems to imply the evolution of Jehovah from a tribal god. But in spite of these occasional errors the book will provide good material for one who desires a study of this type.

P. E. KRETZMANN.

1. **Theologie der Ordnungen.** Von Paul Althaus. Verlag von C. Bertelsmann, Gütersloh. 1935. Preis: M. 2.

2. **Kirchliche Selbstbesinnung und Lebensgestaltung.** Von Adolf Köberle. Heft 3 der Theologie Militans. 1935. A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Leipzig. Preis: M. .45.

3. **Kirche und Staat nach lutherischer Lehre.** Von Paul Althaus. Theologie Militans, Heft 4. Preis: M. .80.

4. **Politisches Christentum.** Von Paul Althaus. Theologie Militans, Heft 5. Preis: M. .80.

Die Schrift „Theologie der Ordnungen" ist in dieser Zeitschrift (1935, S. 882) rezensiert worden. In der zweiten, erweiterten Auflage sind die Ausführungen S. 34—39 besonders instruktiv. Hat die Kirche etwas mit der staatlichen Gesetzgebung, mit der sozialen Frage usw. zu tun? „Das von der Kirche verkündete Evangelium enthält kein politisches oder soziales Programm." Aber „allerdings hat auch die Kirche eine Aufgabe am Gesetz: ihre Verkündigung soll das Gesetz als Gesetz Gottes erkennen lehren, das heißt, in seinem radikalen Ernste als Forderung der Liebe zu Gott und dem Nächsten. . . . Das Gesetz wird also formell ein anderes". Aber noch mehr! „Die Verkündigung der Kirche soll zu dem Volksgesetz nicht nur formell, sondern auch materiell das Wort nehmen. Es ist nicht selbstverständlich, daß das Volksgesetz die in Gottes Offenbarung gesetzten Normen überall achtet: die Heiligkeit des Lebens, auch des keimenden; die Heiligkeit der lebenslänglichen Einehe; die Hoheit des Schöpfers, der allein unserm Leben Ziel und Grenze setzt und uns den Selbstmord wie auch die

Euthanasie, die ‚Vernichtung lebensunwerten Lebens', verwehrt. Die ‚Vernunft' kann hier überall unter Umständen das Gegenteil für sinnvoll und geboten halten. Sie bedarf der Kritik vom Worte Gottes her." — Und diese Aufgabe erfüllt die Kirche nicht dadurch, daß sie politische und soziale Programme aufstellt, sondern durch ihre Predigt und die Erziehung ihrer Glieder.

D. Köberles Schriftchen „Kirchliche Selbstbesinnung und Lebensgestaltung" ist ein Bußruf an die Kirche. „Die erste und wichtigste Aufgabe der Kirche bleibt die Selbstbesinnung der Kirche auf die Grundlage ihrer Verkündigung", auf das Wesen des Evangeliums. Das ist nicht moralische Belehrung (Moralismus), nicht stimmungsvolle Erhitzung der Seele (Mystizismus) und auch nicht Bestätigung menschlicher Weisheit und Spekulation (Idealismus). „Wird in der protestantischen Kirche nicht mehr protestiert gegen die alten und modernen Verfälschungen des Evangeliums in der eigenen Mitte, dann ist die Kirche dem Untergang nahe und hat ihr Ende verdient." Die nächste Aufgabe der Kirche ist dann die Missionsaufgabe, Mission im weitesten Sinn. „Weil Gott in Christo die Welt geliebt und mit sich versöhnt hat, muß auch von der Kirche Christi immer wieder ein Strom der Liebe und des Segens in die Welt hineinströmen." Das, die Erkenntnis und die Verkündigung des Evangeliums, gestaltet das Leben der Kirche. — Was ist das Wesen des Evangeliums? Daß Gott in Christo die Welt geliebt und mit sich versöhnt hat. Was aber S. 14 über diese Sache gesagt wird, deckt sich nicht mit der satisfactio vicaria. — Der Kirche wird eine falsche Stellung zugeschrieben in dem Satz: „Gottes Geist ist für uns nur faßbar in seinem Wort, im verleiblichten Wort des Sakraments, in dem Christusleib der Gemeinde" (S. 17).

„Kirche und Staat nach lutherischer Lehre" ist in erweiterter Gestalt der Vortrag, den D. Althaus am 4. Juli 1935 auf dem deutschen lutherischen Tag in Hannover gehalten hat, „das Glanzstück des lutherischen Tages" (Allgemeine Ev.-Luth. Kirchenzeitung). Er weist einesteils sowohl den Staat als auch die Kirche in ihre Grenzen und zeigt andernteils, wie die Kirche in rechter Weise dem Staat und beide dem Volk dienen können und sollen. An dieser Lektion hat auch die amerikanische Kirche und der amerikanische Staat noch immer zu lernen. — „Der Staat ist in keiner möglichen Gestalt Mittel der Erlösung oder Anbruch des Reiches Gottes" (kein Hilfsgnadenmittel, wie D. Pieper es ausdrückt), sondern allein Werkzeug Gottes zur Erhaltung und Entfaltung dieses irdischen, sündigen Lebens. „Echte Kirche wird sich ängstlich hüten, Staat im Staate zu werden. . . . Wirkt oder drückt sie auf den Staat durch die Massen, die sie hinter sich bringen kann, oder etwa durch ihre wirtschaftliche oder durch ihre internationale Stellung, dann ist ihre Wirkung auf alle Fälle nicht mehr eine kirchliche, sondern die einer Weltmacht; dann ist die Kirche in dieser Hinsicht nicht mehr evangelisch, sondern römisch." „Ist der Staat Träger und Pfleger des nationalen Ethos, dann ist er notwendig auch Erzieher. Aber er ist nicht einziger Erzieher. Die christliche Gemeinde ist für die Erziehung ihrer getauften Kinder vor Gott verantwortlich." „Volk und Staat bedürfen es, daß die natürliche Liebe aus unerschöpftem Quell erneuert, gestärkt, gereinigt werde." In ernster Stunde ist das Wort gesprochen: „Als Christen schulden wir jeder Regierung und Ordnung, die diesen Namen noch verdienen, die Ehre und den Gehorsam, der ihnen als Werkzeug Gottes zukommt, Röm. 13; 1 Petr. 2, 17. Aber innerhalb dessen dürfen wir Unterschiede machen. Wir bitten in der vierten Bitte mit Luther um ‚gut Regiment'." — Jedes Einzelurteil können wir freilich nicht unterschreiben, so z. B. nicht die Definition der Kirche: „Kirche ist Amt. Kirche ist Gemeinde.

Kirche ist als beides wirklich nur im Kirchentum." Aus dem Satz „Das ganze Volk ist ihr [der Kirche] anvertraut als Haufe der Getauften" spricht die falsche landeskirchliche Anschauung.

In dem Artikel „Politisches Christentum" geht D. Althaus scharf ins Gericht mit dem tollen Wahn der Thüringer „Deutschen Christen", die in dem deutschen Volk das Heilsvolk für die ganze Welt sehen, das Gott erlesen habe, „der Welt den wirklich erlösenden Dienst zu erweisen, zu dem sich bis heute kein Volk der Erde fand". Es ist derselbe Irrwahn, der den deutschen Idealismus (Fichte usw.) das geistige Schicksal der Welt an das Schicksal Deutschlands geknüpft sehen ließ. In dieser Verbindung kommt Althaus auch auf andere Völker zu sprechen. „Auch andere Völker haben den Welterlösungsanspruch erhoben und sich als erwähltes Volk gefühlt. Die Angelsachsen haben den Weltkrieg als Kreuzzug für die Menschheitssache der Freiheit und Gerechtigkeit zu führen gemeint." Und in seiner Schrift „Kirche und Staat" (S. 14) weist er darauf hin, daß „das chiliastische Schwärmertum", das in dieser Idee der Thüringer steckt, auch andere Kreise ergriffen hat. „Der christliche Amerikanismus sah im Völkerbunde das Näherkommen des Reiches Gotts; der religiöse Nationalismus der Thüringer Deutschen Christen macht den Anbruch des Dritten Reiches zur Heilsgeschichte." — Kein Volk, auch nicht das deutsche, ist Heilsvolk; „nicht ein Volk bringt der Welt ‚den Erlöser und erlöste Menschen', sondern die Gemeinde JEsu Christi durch ihr Zeugnis von JEsus Christus". Aber dies ist wahr: „Jedes tüchtige Volk lebt für die ganze Menschheit"; und Althaus darf hinzusetzen: „das deutsche Volk sicherlich mehr als manches andere". Noch ein ernstes Wort: „Unser Volk bedarf für seinen neuen Weg der schlichten Gottesfurcht unserer Väter." Th. Engelder.

Decisive Days in Social and Religious Progress. By *Ada Wright Leonard.* The Abingdon Press, New York, N. Y. 155 pages, 5¼×8. Price, $1.50.

This book contains five lectures by Bishop Leonard, formerly pastor of the American Methodist Church and instructor in the Italian theological school of the M. E. Church at Rome. The lectures were delivered at Chautauqua, New York, during the summer of 1934 and treat the following topics: The Present-day War Menace; The Danger Threatening Our Nation from the Repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment; Christian Education; the Recovery of Missionary Interest among Christians of To-day; The Need of Evangelism to Heal the Spiritual Perplexity Prevailing in the Churches Just Now. The lectures are well written, very interesting, and packed with vital information. Frequently, however, the writer in his judgments misses the mark. The reviewer was pleased with the author's positive emphasis on the need of frankly confessing our Christian, Biblical truths. Here is a sample: "Some ministers in their social contacts as well as in their sermons seem to shrink from referring to Jesus as the Savior. They do not hesitate to discuss theories and philosophies relating to the social and economic order, but to lift up Christ as Lord and Savior, and without hesitation or apology, is altogether too rare. If the great affirmations of the Christian faith are absent from the preacher's message, what is left to meet the supreme need of men? In many quarters there is a fear of making a positive or categorical affirmation about sin or salvation from sin through faith in Christ. All of this has a paralyzing effect upon both ministers and people" (p. 141).

Such statements show that Modernism in the sectarian circles of our country is losing its hold on some ministers and laymen. But that the Bible is the sole source of the Christian faith is a truth which Bishop Leonard has not yet learned. He writes: "I am not unmindful of the danger in evangelistic preaching not based upon the facts of *Christian experience*" (142). So the Christian experimentalists spoke in Germany about half a century ago. To-day the German theologians representing the *Bekenntniskreise* speak differently. Let us hope that also the positive Methodists will turn from Christian experience to the Bible of God as the sole norm of their teachings. J. T. Mueller.

Martin Luther, der Zeuge auf der Kanzel. Ausgewählte Predigten mit einem Faksimile. Calwer Vereinsbuchhandlung, Stuttgart. 465 Seiten 5×7½. Preis, in Leinenband: RM. 5.

An diesem Buche haben wir unsere helle Freude gehabt und gedenken, auch in Zukunft es oft zu gebrauchen. Ist doch dieser dritte Band der Calwer Lutherausgabe eine Zusammenstellung von fünfundvierzig ausgewählten Predigten des Reformators, in zwölf Gruppen geordnet: Vom rechten Verständnis der Heiligen Schrift; Von Christus, dem menschgewordenen König; Von Christus, dem Heiland und Vorbild; Von Christus, dem leidenden Versöhner; Von Christus, dem auferstandenen Sieger; Vom Heiligen Geist, dem Anwalt Christi bei den Seinen; Von der Offenbarung des Vaters, des Sohnes, des Heiligen Geistes; Vom Werden und Leben der Kirche im Heiligen Geist; Von der Gemeinschaft der Kirche und ihrem Trost im Wort; Vom Sieg der Kirche über die Anfechtung; Von der Bewährung der Kirche in der Welt; Vom Warten der Kirche auf die Vollendung. Jede Predigt hat ihre eigene Überschrift, und auch die verschiedenen Teile jeder Predigt sind durch besondere Überschriften gekennzeichnet. Wir können freilich nicht alle Anmerkungen unterschreiben, wie wenn der Herausgeber z. B. auf Seite 143 bemerkt: „‚Hölle' bedeutet für das Glaubensbekenntnis zunächst einfach den Ort der Toten." Besonders wertvoll ist die dem Bande vorangestellte „Einführung" und hier wieder insonderheit der erste Teil, „Die Bedeutung der Predigt bei Luther", deren Ausführungen in jeder Hinsicht beherzigenswert sind.

P. E. Kretzmann.

The Ancient World. A Beginning by *T. R. Glover*. The Macmillan Company, New York. 388 pages, 5¼×8. Price, $2.50.

This is not an exhaustive history of ancient times, but a presentation of its high-lights. It is, in effect, a philosophy of history presented in a very interesting, if not always a fully convincing, fashion. The author draws many parallels between ancient conditions and those of the present time, so that the ancient Greek and Roman and Carthaginian names again stand out in bold relief, often invested with a new meaning. The author possesses the happy faculty of being able to shed light on a subject by means of an epigrammatic saying, as, for example, in chapter 2: "A man may load his memory with all kinds of things and still be, as the English poet wrote —

"A book-full blockhead, ignorantly bred,
With loads of learned lumber in his head. . . .

There were no newspapers to tell what had not happened," etc. — The weakest chapters of the book are those on the Jews and on the Christian

Church in the Roman Empire, possibly on account of their brevity, possibly on account of certain misconceptions which make the reader think that the author is not exactly sympathetic to the Scripture account. For a brief review of the history of the classical ages of Greece and Rome the book will serve excellently well. P. E. KRETZMANN.

World History. An Epitome, in Chronological Order, of Remarkable Events from the Creation Forward. By *Robert Newton Waring*. Fleming H. Revell Company, New York. 179 pages. Price, $1.75.

The book contains nothing but dates, arranged chronologically on 109 pages, then alphabetically, beginning with the Creation and ending with the inauguration of the Commonwealth of the Philippines in 1935. It is a handy book to have, though it contains objectionable features. For a Christian it begins inauspiciously; the first "date" (left blank) is the "original creation, ages ago"; second "date" (also blank) a catastrophe, at a remote period, in which the earth becomes a lifeless ruin, which accounts for fossils, petrified remains, and changes the axis of the globe. Then the renewal and replenishment of the lifeless earth is set in 4125 B. C. On the other hand, there are numerous positive statements; "1615, Genesis, initial book of the Bible, is penned by Moses." A great part of the B. C. section follows a strange chronology, different from any I have seen to date. On the selection of dates for such a book no two persons will ever agree; yet it seems strange to omit Hammurabi, but to include the Hanging Gardens of Babylon; to omit the regnal dates of Saul, David, and Solomon, but to state with astonishing conviction: "1072 David of Israel fells the Philistine giant Goliath." In justice to the author, however, it should be said that he has published another volume, *Bible History — Genesis to Revelation* (which I do not know); this volume therefore does not generally give dates from church history. In later ancient history and in the Christian era I have found the dates reliable as far as I have compared them. But the price of the book, in my opinion, is too high. THEO. HOYER.

Friends of Jesus. By *Elsie E. Egermeier*. The Warner Press, Anderson, Ind. 216 pages, 5¾×8¼. Price, $1.50.

Miss Egermeier is well known in our circles ever since her *Bible Story Book* became a welcome friend in thousands of our homes. In this new book she treats the Book of Acts. We did not read the entire volume, but the chapters we did read again impressed us by the vivid and fascinating style which is characteristic of the authoress. A number of inaccuracies could be corrected in a later edition. On page 76 the authoress says: "When the believers spoke of their fellow-believers, they called them 'saints'; for these men and women had their hearts purified by faith in Jesus. Therefore they lived holy lives, as true saints do." The believers were saints not so much because of their sanctification, but primarily because of their justification. The introductory chapters are rather unsatisfactory. The total depravity of man should have been stressed to a greater degree, and it certainly is a misstatement to say, "God watched over them" (his earth-children after they had disobeyed Him and had forsaken His Law), "and sometimes He saw some here and

there who really looked to do right; always He would help such persons" (p. 17). On the same page we read that "God could not come down to the world of man, as He did at the beginning, to show them that He is very God." Here would have been a splendid opportunity to show that God did reveal Himself in the Word of the Bible.

TH. LAETSCH.

The One and the Many. A Brief Calvinistic Contribution on the American Social Problem. By *R. J. Danhof.* 32 pages, 5×7¾. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich. Price, 25 cts.

The nature of this paper-bound booklet is sufficiently characterized by its subtitle. In discussing the present difficulties in the social field, the author explains at some length the relation of Calvinism to the state. Some passages of real interest occur, as, for example: "The killing of millions of pigs and the plowing under of many furrows of cotton has not been able to solve the problem of the one and the many. . . . From the doctrine of individualism and *laissez faire* we are gradually embarking into the sphere of political and governmental life, which advocates more governmental and state interference." (P. 18.) Every one who is studying Calvinism in its present attitude toward the Government will find this booklet extremely illuminating.

P. E. KRETZMANN.

Eingegangene Literatur.

„Luthertum" für April bringt zum Andenken an das Calvinjubiläum einen Artikel über „Prädestination" von Tobias Pöhlmann sowie den Schluß des Artikels über „Martin Kähler als lutherischer Theologe" von H. E. Weber. In den Bücherbesprechungen findet sich auch eine Rezension eines wichtigen Buches von Theodor Voß, „Neuordnung evangelischer Jugendarbeit".

From Fleming H. Revell Company, New York, London, and Edinburgh: —

Carry a Little Honey, and Other Addresses. By *William Orlando Carrington.* 206 pages, 5×7½. Price, $1.75.

From Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich.: —

Three: Sixteens. Ten Sermons on 3:16 Texts. By *M. E. Dodd, A. M., D. D., LL. D.* 146 pages, 5½×8. Price, $1.00.

NOTICE TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS.

In order to render satisfactory service, we must have our current mailing-list correct. The expense of maintaining this list has been materially increased. Under present regulations we are subject to a "fine" on all parcels mailed to an incorrect address, inasmuch as we must pay 2 cents for every notification sent by the postmaster on a parcel or periodical which is undeliverable because no forwarding address is available or because there has been a change of address. This may seem insignificant, but in view of the fact that we have subscribers getting three or more of our periodicals and considering our large aggregate subscription list, it may readily be seen that it amounts to quite a sum during a year; for the postmaster will address a notification to each individual periodical. Our subscribers can help us by notifying us — one notification (postal card, costing only 1 cent) will take care of the addresses for several publications. We shall be very grateful for your cooperation.

Kindly consult the address label on this paper to ascertain whether your subscription has expired or will soon expire. "July 36" on the label means that your subscription has expired. Please pay your agent or the Publisher promptly in order to avoid interruption of service. It takes about two weeks before the address label can show change of address or acknowledgment of remittance.

When paying your subscription, please mention name of publication desired and exact name and address (both old and new, if change of address is requested).

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, St. Louis, Mo.